The Dissertation Committee for Amanda Ziemba Randall Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Translating the Discipline: On the Institutional Memory of German *Volkskunde*, 1945 to Present

Committee:

Katherine Arens, Supervisor

Sabine Hake

John Hoberman

Marc Pierce

Angela Nonaka

Translating the Discipline: On the Institutional Memory of German *Volkskunde*, 1945 to Present

by

Amanda Ziemba Randall, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2015

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my adviser and mentor, Katherine Arens, for her patient guidance and sustaining enthusiasum over these last years, and for the many opportunities she gave me for professional and scholarly growth. I also would like to thank Sabine Hake for her mentorship in scholarly writing and for two wonderful years at *German Studies Review* watching our field's institutional memory unfold together; John Hoberman for his careful reading and insistence on clarity, especially concerning the theoretical elements of this work; Marc Pierce for valuable professional advice and for reminding me not to overlook *Volkskunde*'s shared genealogy with Germanic linguistics; and Angela Nonaka for enthusiastic encouragement and for providing a structured intellectual space within which to articulate this project in its beginning stages. For her feedback and encouragement in the last phase of writing, I also would like to thank Janet Swaffar.

A number of anthropologists in the U.S. and Germany also guided and supported me at different stages along the twelve-year path to this dissertation. I would like to especially thank Robert Rotenberg at DePaul University; George Marcus and James D. Faubion at Rice University; Ina-Maria Greverus, Gisela Welz, and Regina Römhild at the Goethe University of Frankfurt am Main; Dorle Dracklé at the University of Bremen; Werner Krauss at the Helmholtz Center Geesthacht Institute of Coastal Research; and Mary Beth Stein at George Washington University.

This project would not have been possible without the generous financial support of the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and The University of Texas at Austin, through which I was able to spend two summers conducting ethnographic and archival research in Germany and Austria. The interview protocol was approved by the University's Institutional Review Board (2010-03-0104). I would like to thank my generous interviewees at university institutes of *Volkskunde*, *Europäische Ethnologie*, and *Ethnologie* in Germany and Austria.

I thank my dissertation writing group, Karin Maxey, Christina Walter-Gensler, and David Hünlich, for their valuable feedback on my writing and invaluable moral support. Thank you to my copyeditor, Monica Birth Hoesch. Thank you to the friends who aided and sheltered me during my whirlwind fieldwork in 2010 and 2011: Sarah Orlovsky and Monika Ritter, Grit Lehmann and Rainer Rebuschat, Mercedeh Golriz and Ali Esmi, G. Gwenn Hiller and Jan Hoffmann, Austin and Britta Moore, Oliver Hinkelbein, Bradley Boovy, and Fr. Martin Löwenstein.

I want to thank my parents, Dennis and Carol Ziemba (may they rest in peace) for raising me to be a professional student, whether they meant to or not. Finally, this project would not have been possible without the love and support of my husband, Mason Randall, and the laughter and smiles of our son, August. I love you both dearly. Thank you.

Translating the Discipline: On the Institutional Memory of German *Volkskunde*, 1945 to Present

Amanda Ziemba Randall, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2015

Supervisor: Katherine Arens

This study examines how Europeanist ethnologists (*Volkskundler / Europäische Ethnologen*) in Germany (East, West, and reunified) have reconstructed their discipline's history from the end of World War II to the present. In this treatment, historiography is understood not simply as a discourse, but as a narrative performance by and for parties invested in the discipline. These performances, it will be shown, have real implications for the field's organizational and epistemic structuring, and vice versa—a symbiosis referred to here as "institutional memory."

The project's goal is not to produce another history of the discipline, but rather to trace how institutional memory is rewritten or translated (in André Lefevere's sense) across historical ruptures and in conversation with other social fields (in Pierre Bourdieu's sense). By mapping the disciplinary identities performed by the field's authorized parties in monographs, articles, programmatic statements, and interviews conducted with three generations of *Volkskundler* / *Europäische Ethnologen*, the analysis reveals to what extent the field's institutional memory aligns with postwar Germany's ongoing struggle to connect its past with its current national and global identities.

Part I considers how the trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* (overcoming the past) came to dominate institutional memory in West German and post-reunification *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie*. Parts II and III then consider latent and emergent

boundary issues that had been eclipsed by the long shadow of the National Socialist past. Part II examines the dynamics of East German *Volkskunde*'s institutional memory and the challenge of gathering the two national traditions into a unified institutional memory after national reunification in 1989/90. Part III considers patterns of interdisciplinary and international boundary-crossing and -reinforcement shown to be both latent across the field's postwar institutional memory and emergent as the field continues to translate its identity in confronting new external pressures. By considering narrative performances of boundary problems as sites of institutional memory in their own right, the final analysis reveals how the preoccupation with the effects of the Nazi era is in fact only one of several possible, concurrent translations of a centuries-old anxiety over the field's legitimacy as an independent and institutionalized scientific discipline.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Germany's Europeanist ethnology is a discipline obsessed with its past. In the seventy years since the end of World War II, the cultural science formerly known uniformly as *Volkskunde*—glossed in English as folklore studies, cultural anthropology, or European ethnology, depending on the author and context—has produced an inordinate amount of historiographic discourse for a comparatively small scholarly field.[1] It is a self-consciously fractured, incomplete historiography that at times struggles to construct a clear disciplinary profile. The fraught state of the discipline's historical identity narrative is still reflected today in the field's most surface-level identifier: the diverse, typically compound names attached to the twenty-six institutes that make up its university presence in Germany; combinations of *Volkskunde*, *Europäische Ethnologie*,

[1] As of January 2015, the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde* (http://d-g-v.org), the field's main professional organization in the German-speaking world, counts twenty-six university institutes of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* in Germany—a country with over one hundred universities and colleges. In terms of the total number of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* professorships in Germany, the field has less than one-tenth the total number of tenured faculty members of its neighbors history, sociology, or German literature. (See also Harm-Peer Zimmermann, *Empirische Kulturwissenschaft, Europäische Ethnologie, Kulturanthropologie, Volkskunde: Leitfaden für das Studium einer Kulturwissenschaft an deutschsprachigen Universitäten—Deutschland, Österreich, Schweiz* (Marburg: Jonas, 2005), 14.) The largest institute by number of tenured professors (holding the title Prof. Dr.) is the Institut für Europäische Ethnologie at the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, which has five full professors (Professor/innen), and six untenured (*außerplanmäßig*) and emeritus professors. Compare this with the number of full professors in German literature (13) or social sciences (16) at the same university.

Kulturanthropologie, *Empirische Kulturwissenschaft* comprise the typical nomenclature.[2] The code is difficult for a student beginning the major coursework to decipher, and even more so for a complete disciplinary outsider. It is also the surface manifestation of a deeper translation problem between Germany's tradition and other national or regional anthropologies.

The dispersed titles and the multifaceted field these terms collectively represent are the result of German *Volkskunde*'s post–World War II engagement with its wartime and prewar past. A study in critical historiography in cultural context, this dissertation examines how this scientific community constructed and reconstructed the field's history—and with that, its identity—from 1945 to the present. This study fits most intuitively within two international bodies of scholarship: the history of anthropology, and the history of German sciences (*Wissenschaften*,[3] both natural sciences and humanities).

Studies in the history of anthropology formed part of the rise of history of science studies in the 1980s. At first mainly an interest among anthropologists curious about their

---

[2] The name of this field is a major point of contention that is addressed throughout this work. For this reason, the nomenclature used to refer to it will shift in the course of the analysis, in chronological step with debates and their results for disciplinary identity. When speaking of the field prior to the 1960s, when a major rupture in its identity occurred, I speak in terms of *Volkskunde*, its uniform name since the mid-nineteenth century. After the 1960s, I refer to *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* when speaking of the West- and reunified German tradition, and *Volkskunde* or *Ethnographie* when speaking of the East German tradition. When speaking of the field as a whole, apart from the temporary national division during the Cold War years, I refer to it solely as *Volkskunde*, the term that unites them through that period. The terminology will sometimes vary, however, when speaking of specific, alternative lines of thought concerning disciplinary identity. To distinguish the German-speaking tradition from the analogous European tradition, I refer to the former with German terms, and the latter with the English term, European ethnology. I also may refer to European ethnology when citing English-language sources that refer to the German field in English translation—an issue that also will be discussed in this work.

It should also be noted that, when referring to Germany's non-Europeanist ethnological tradition, I will refer to *Völkerkunde*, its name until the 1950s, and *Ethnologie*, the uniform title chosen for the field from the 1950s onward. When speaking of the Europeanist and non-Europeanist fields together, I at times will speak in terms of *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* to avoid confusion, as both fields converged on the term *Ethnologie* in the 1960/70s for reasons that will be explained in the course of the exposition.

[3] Unless otherwise noted, all translations from German into English are my own.

own tradition, by now it has become an interdisciplinary and international endeavor. In the Anglophone anthropological traditions (which encompasses cultural, biological, and linguistic anthropologies, as well as archaeology and folklore studies), the most prolific contributor to disciplinary historiography is George W. Stocking, Jr.[4] But the history of Germany's two main anthropological traditions—a non-Europeanist branch of ethnology (*Völkerkunde*) and a Germanist / Europeanist branch that will be the focus of this study (*Volkskunde*)[5]—also has been treated in the Anglophone sphere. However, in that case the focus is primarily on the non-Europeanist tradition as the analogue to Anglophone social / cultural anthropology.[6] Moreover, Anglophone studies of the German fields'

[4] See, for instance, George W. Stocking, ed., *Volksgeist as Method and Ethic Essays on Boasian Ethnography and the German Anthropological Tradition* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996); George W. Stocking, ed., *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985); George W. Stocking, ed., *Colonial Situations: Essays on the Contextualization of Ethnographic Knowledge* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991); George W. Stocking, ed., *Functionalism Historicized: Essays on British Social Anthropology* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984); George W. Stocking, *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology* (New York: Free Press, 1968); George W. Stocking, *After Tylor: British Social Anthropology, 1888–1951* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995). See also the historiographic work of his student, Regna Darnell: Regna Darnell, *Edward Sapir: Linguist, Anthropologist, Humanist* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990); Regna Darnell, *And Along Came Boas: Continuity and Revolution in Americanist Anthropology* (Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 1998); Regna Darnell, *Invisible Genealogies: A History of Americanist Anthropology* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001); Regna Darnell and Julia D. Harrison, eds., *Historicizing Canadian Anthropology* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2006).

[5] In contrast to the American tradition, not only is German-speaking anthropology (or ethnology) traditionally distinguished by region (German [and now European] versus non-European). It also does not include linguistic or biological anthropologies, or archaeology, which have traditionally been organized institutionally as, or under, separate fields. On the history of German archaeology, see Suzanne L. Marchand, *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996). However, this disciplinary organization is, as with all disciplinary formations, unstable. In the last two decades, for instance, some *Volkskunde* university institutes have been reorganized into interdisciplinary institutes. *Volkskunde* at the University of Bonn is now a division of the Institut für Archäologie und Kulturanthropologie, for example. Also, the new interdisciplinary fields of intercultural communications and medical anthropology have emerged within or adjacent to some institutes of German *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* (as well as *Völkerkunde* / *Ethnologie*), thus extending the purview of research and teaching at *some* institutes into the areas of language and biology.

[6] H. Glenn Penny and Matti Bunzl, *Worldly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003); H. Glenn Penny, *Objects of Culture: Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002); Andrew Zimmerman, *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2001); Fredrik Barth et al., *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French, and*

histories through the twentieth century tend to focus on the National Socialist ideologization of science as a crippling rupture from which both branches struggled to recover.[7] Also in step with the rise of history of science studies was the coalescence of a large, international corpus of German cases. As with the case of anthropology, this research body contains a remarkably robust specialization in Nazi-era science and gives comparatively little attention to developments after World War II.[8]

American Anthropology (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005); Henrika Kuklick, ed., *A New History of Anthropology* (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2008); Andrew D. Evans, *Anthropology at War: World War I and the Science of Race in Germany* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2010).

[7] H. Glenn Penny's contribution to *A New History of Anthropology* is a case in point: it deals only with *Völkerkunde* (the non-Europeanist tradition), even though *Volkskunde* has seen itself since the 1970s as conversant with international anthropologies and not just folklore studies (its identity up to that point). Moreover, Penny's discussion, though it begins by reflexively considering the typical historiographic focus on that field's co-option in National Socialism, nonetheless arrives at a conclusion that keeps Germany's anthropology squarely in the frame of National Socialism. Indeed, he does not discuss any scholarship in the field produced since the Nazi era except for German contributions to their own field's historiography, suggesting that little if no scientific progress has been made there since the early 1930s. H. Glenn Penny, "Traditions in the German Language," in *A New History of Anthropology*, ed. Henrika Kuklick (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2008), 79–95. In a similar contribution to an English-language anthology on the histories of the major Western anthropological traditions, Austrian anthropologist Andre Gingrich states plainly that "there is no good overview in English of post-1945 development," for either of the German-speaking branches (which he treats together, though giving more attention to *Völkerkunde*, to which he belongs). André Gingrich, "The German-Speaking Countries," in *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French, and American Anthropology*, by André Gingrich et al. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005), 153.

[8] See, for instance, Wolfgang Bialas and Anson Rabinbach, eds., *Nazi Germany and the Humanities* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2007); Ingo Haar, *Historiker im Nationalsozialismus: Deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft und der "Volkstumskampf" im Osten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000); Winfried Schulze and Otto Gerhard Oexle, eds., *Deutsche Historiker im Nationalsozialismus* (Frankfurt: Fischer Taschenbuch, 1999); Frank-Rutger Hausmann, ed., *Die Rolle der Geisteswissenschaften im Dritten Reich, 1933–1945* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 2002); Christopher Hutton, *Linguistics and the Third Reich: Mother-Tongue Fascism, Race and the Science of Language* (London: Routledge, 1999); Bernard Mees, *The Science of the Swastika* (New York: Central European University Press, 2008); Stefan Wilking, *Der Deutsche Sprachatlas im Nationalsozialismus: Studien zu Dialektologie und Sprachwissenschaft zwischen 1933 und 1945* (New York: G. Olms, 2003); Klaas-Hinrich Ehlers, *Der Wille zur Relevanz: Die Sprachforschung und ihre Förderung durch die DFG 1920–1970* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2010); Utz Maas, *Verfolgung und Auswanderung deutschsprachiger Sprachforscher 1933–1945* (Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2010); Christopher Hutton, *Race and the Third Reich: Linguistics, Racial Anthropology and Genetics in the Dialectic of Volk* (Cambridge: Polity, 2005); Clemens Knobloch, *Volkhafte Sprachforschung: Studien zum Umbau der Sprachwissenschaft in Deutschland zwischen 1918 und 1945* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2005); Ute Deichmann, *Biologists under Hitler* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996); Dieter Hoffmann and Mark Walker, *The German Physical Society in the Third Reich* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Monika Renneberg and Mark Walker, *Science, Technology, and National Socialism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Margit Szöllösi-Janze, *Science in the Third Reich* (New York:

The present study intends to reach beyond the analytical scope of these earlier bodies of research by offering a critical *meta*history of the *internal* historiography of *postwar* Germany's *Volkskunde*. That is, in this treatment, historiography is understood not simply as a discourse, but as a narrative performance by members of that scientific community for parties invested in the discipline—a performance for the *Volkskundler* themselves, their students, state-sponsored university hierarchies and scientific funding bodies, international anthropological circles, and the German public. But the analysis presented in the chapters of this study is not limited to the level of discourse. Rather, the major implication of this case study in the history of science is its delineation of the way intradisciplinary discourse affects or is affected by the epistemic and organizational structures of the field.

As a consequence, the goal of the project is not to produce yet another history of the discipline, or to pretend to offer a complete picture of its postwar development, but rather to mobilize discursive examples to shed light on two aspects of this field's self-construction that will, in turn, illuminate our understanding of the history of science more broadly. These aspects are:

1) How the field's discursive identity performances have real implications for its institutional and epistemic structuring, and vice versa—a symbiosis I refer to as "institutional memory."
2) How institutional memory is rewritten or "translated" (in André Lefevere's sense) across historical ruptures and in conversation with other social fields (in Bourdieu's sense), public and specialist.

Berg, 2001); Sheila Faith Weiss, *The Nazi Symbiosis: Human Genetics and Politics in the Third Reich* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2010); Gretchen Engle Schafft, *From Racism to Genocide: Anthropology in the Third Reich* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004); Wolf Lepenies, *Wissenschaften im Nationalsozialismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).

These questions will be addressed through mapping the disciplinary identities performed by the field's authorized parties in monographs, articles, and programmatic statements published between 1945 and today, and in the more than sixty interviews I conducted with three generations of German anthropologists beginning in 2010/11, with extended conversations reaching to 2015.

A major implication of this particular case study is its exposition of how and to what extent *Volkskunde*'s institutional memory aligns with postwar Germany's ongoing struggle to connect its past in the broadest sense with its current national and global identities. Often times, this comes down to dealing with the period of National Socialist rule (1933–1945). In focusing on the time span of 1945 to today, this nation's process of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* (dealing with or overcoming the National Socialist past) will be confirmed as a major reference point in institutional memory in conversation with public discourse, not just for its historical consciousness. However, as the final analysis will reveal, by the turn of the twenty-first century, German society, and the field of *Volkskunde* as a part of it, began to shift the basis of its sense of self away from the past and toward the present and future, as Germany becomes a political and economic anchor in the European and global community.

However intuitive it may seem for the German case, reducing the purpose of disciplinary historiography to a matter of legitimation, as scholars in the field of history of science are wont to argue,[9] is a scholarly assumption this dissertation aims to contest. While the drive to redeem *Volkskunde* after its involvement in the ideological project of the National Socialist regime might explain the prolific postwar disciplinary identity narratives, it is not the only organizer of institutional memory in the postwar era. While

[9] See, for instance, the essays collected in Loren R. Graham, Wolf Lepenies, and Peter Weingart, eds., *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*, Sociology of the Sciences 7 (Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1983). The full layout of this argument will be treated in the next chapter.

the exclusivity of focus on "conquering" the past has, on the one hand, to do with processes of "normalization" in Germany's relationship to the rest of the world, this analysis aims to show how alternative tropes of institutional memory were present throughout the postwar era, and in fact extend to prewar discussions reaching back to the nineteenth century. Thus, while the present study begins by tracing sites of resonance between public and disciplinary discourses with reference to the Nazi period, ultimately, the research presented here reveals how, contrary to precedent studies of this issue, the postwar historiography of Germany's *Volkskunde*, cannot be reduced to an exercise in *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*.

As will be outlined below, in recounting the history of their discipline, German *Volkskundler* since 1945 have variously fixated on several, at times intersecting, factors unique to that national tradition. Most prominent among them is the need to come to terms with its entanglements with Nazi racial ideology; but they also continue to express a centuries-old anxiety over the field's legitimacy as an independent scholarly discipline; the forty-year division of the discipline between West German (Federal Republic of Germany / FRG) and East German (German Democratic Republic / GDR) political alignments; and supranational pressures to align with international patterns of disciplinary thought, practice, and organization.

This study thus will examine how these and other central issues in the field's internal historiography emerged and were transformed across major turning points in German society and politics from the immediate postwar period to the present. To reiterate: the goal of the project is not to produce a comprehensive history of the field, but rather to intervene in the flow of historical discourse emanating from the field itself by uncovering how these central historical reference points have been and are still mobilized to support a scientific community's self-construction as a self-authorizing academic

discipline.

ORIGINS OF STUDY AND RESULTING METHODOLOGY

The idea for this dissertation is the product of over ten years of personal exposure to the field in question. I have had an interest in, and personal relationship to, Germany's *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnology* since I was an International Studies undergraduate student in the early 2000s. A senior honors thesis on this history of *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* in the German-speaking countries was an introduction to the field—its central questions, methods, theories, figures, institutions. Already through that preliminary foray—which was entitled "The Rebirth of Germanophone Anthropology"—it was clear to me that the discipline was deeply shaken by, and was even then still attempting to recover from the National Socialist period. That research laid the foundation for a year of Fulbright Fellowship-sponsored postbaccalaureate study at the Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie (KA/EE) at the Goethe University of Frankfurt am Main in 2002–2003. There, I studied under the institute's founder, Ina-Maria Greverus, her student and successor, Gisela Welz, and several other professors who led or would soon become leaders in the field.

Emerging from my research on the history of Germany's two traditions of ethnology, my goal for that Fulbright year was to see how German students in the present learn—and researchers practice—a field analogous to, but still distinct from American cultural anthropology, my concentration within my undergraduate major. I considered this endeavor not just as an extension of my education in anthropology, but as an exercise in ethnographic fieldwork. Although I did not frame my presence in this way to my professors and peers in Germany, our shared interest and training in ethnography

supported a mutual understanding, and even an expectation, that I was a participant-observer there, absorbing and interpreting my experiences through an ethnographic eye. That is, I was mindful of the differences between what I knew of the US-American anthropological tradition and what I was witnessing of the German.

The comparison of these intellectual cultures continued through my graduate study in cultural anthropology at Rice University, a progressive, self-styled experimental program with which the KA/EE institute was forming a regular connection during this nascent period of this project. Even as I moved from anthropology to interdisciplinary German Studies in 2009, observations that I made during my studies in Frankfurt continued to fascinate me. Among the issues that especially intrigued me were, 1) the dominance of Anglophone and Francophone theory taught in the courses, 2) frequent discussions among professors and students alike—in tones ranging from resignation to irritation—about the need to present research in English, and 3) the lack of centralized institutional oversight for ethnographic research familiar to me in the form of American Institutional Review Boards. These observations came to form the initial questions I hoped to pursue in this dissertation.

My initial inclination was to examine the first two of these issues within a framework of critical translation studies. Working partly ethnographically, I planned to study German anthropology's experience of the international circulation of knowledge. For this, I followed the basic principles of grounded theory,[10] which I understand as a

[10] "Grounded theory" is a general qualitative research approach wherein the research question(s) are regularly reviewed and modified in the course of data-gathering. By grounding research not in a given theory to be substantiated or hypothesis to be tested, but in the research data itself, this dynamic approach is meant to free the researcher to generate new concepts for understanding social and cultural phenomena. Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research* (Chicago: Aldine, 1967).

formalized adaptation of the "serendipity principle"[11] common to ethnographic fieldwork. Beginning with the *Volkskundler* / *Europäische Ethnologen* with whom I had maintained contact since my time in Frankfurt, I began exploratory research for the project by conducting open-ended, semistructured interviews with professionals and students in the field in the summers of 2010 and 2011. Proceeding through snowball sampling,[12] by the end of this fieldwork, I had collected over sixty interviews with three generations of this community's members at thirteen different university institutes.[13] I also conducted participant-observation at a subsection of these institutes, which included attending

[11]The serendipity principle as discussed by anthropologist Ina-Maria Greverus is a matter of attention to the moment, such that one discovers phenomena for which one was not even searching. More than a matter of accidental discovery, serendipity for a trained ethnographer is a matter of drawing meaning from unexpected encounters or realization for the furthering of one's horizon of experience, and from there, one's horizon of research. Ina-Maria Greverus, *Anthropologisch reisen* (Münster: LIT, 2002), 33–34. See also Rolf Lindner, *Die Entdeckung der Stadtkultur: Soziologie aus der Erfahrung der Reportage* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1990), 220–223; Amanda Ziemba, "Serendipity Principle," in *Von Alltagswelt bis Zwischenraum: Eine kleine kulturanthropologische Enzyklopädie*, ed. Gisela Welz, Ramona Lenz, and Ina-Maria Greverus (Münster: LIT, 2005), 121–22.

[12] Snowball sampling is often used to reach difficult-to-access or hidden populations, including elite or expert communities, as in the case of this study. There are, of course, two well-known caveats of snowball sampling: The sample can expand not only quickly, but possibly uncontrollably. And, it can become skewed toward one social network. Sarah J. Tracy, *Qualitative Research Methods Collecting Evidence, Crafting Analysis, Communicating Impact* (Chicester: Wiley, 2012), 136. These caveats certainly affected my own field research. Snowball sampling was the most appropriate approach for the beginning, exploratory phase research within this expert field, given my positionality. However, the enduring fracturedness of this field became apparent to me during the second phase research, as my interlocutors frequently pointed me back to the same networks of like-minded institutes that represent only a portion (though a sizeable one) of the field. As my research focus also shifted in the course of fieldwork from a synchronic to a diachronic focus, I decided at the end of the second fieldwork excursion not to gather further interviews. If I were to pursue a primarily interview-based study of this field, interviews with *Volkskundler* / *Europäische Ethnologen* at additional institutes would be required.

[13] At the outset of the fieldwork, I also included scholars at an Austrian university. However, I ultimately chose to exclude these from the project, as Austrian *Volkskunde*, while having certain confluences with the German tradition, nonetheless diverges in important ways from my main field of inquiry. For a recent treatment of the history of *Volkskunde* in Austria, see James R. Dow and Olaf Bockhorn, *The Study of European Ethnology in Austria* (Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2004).On the other hand, I chose to include interviews with *Ethnologen* practicing in Germany's other ethnological tradition (*Völkerkunde* / *Ethnologie*) who, unlike the majority of their colleagues, choose to focus their research in Europe. Their perspective was important to include, as it illuminates the ongoing question of interdisciplinary boundary-maintenance and -crossing.

classes and department colloquia, and meeting informally with professors and doctoral students in a social setting.[14]

As is always the case in ethnographic fieldwork, however, the questions with which I entered the field morphed in the course of my interviews and observations. When I began to review my interview recordings and field notes, I recognized even more clearly that, while the conversations were initially meant to address the topic of translation and the international politics of knowledge circulation, inevitably, the implications of the field's history and boundaries with neighboring fields would come up. Sometimes, it would be in reference to disciplinary keywords—both concepts developed in other traditions that gained currency in the German tradition, and German concepts that were circulating internationally. What was reiterated to me over and over was that theoretical knowledge transfer was unbalanced, the historical reasoning for which would then be explained to me.

As this pattern of discourse began to solidify, I realized that the question of translation and knowledge circulation in the present was in fact a surface phenomenon embedded in a deep and fraught history and a more general problem in science studies. For that reason, my interview question roster shifted somewhat between the 2010 and 2011 field trips to reflect an expanded notion of translation. In addition to the surface level of interlingual translation as a lead-in for the conversation, I included questions directed toward other issues of translation, namely:

1) between past events within the field and present disciplinary structures (epistemic and organizational)

[14] I furthermore presented an introductory lecture on practices of informed consent in ethnographic research. While conducting my fieldwork, I was also invited to return to certain institutes to present the results of this research, which, depending on travel resources, I intend to do, for giving back to the community that permitted me access in order to conduct ethnographic research is a core ethical value in contemporary cultural anthropology.

2) between *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* and neighboring specialist fields, in Germany and internationally
3) between this specialist field and other social fields in Germany and abroad, including the public broadly conceived, but also official entities like funding bodies and the state.

Undoubtedly, my noticing of these patterns and willingness to follow them in open-ended interviews has something to do with my prior knowledge and interest in those issues. But this ought not to be considered detrimental or delegitimating for the project. Researching in an ethnographic mode—wherein the researcher simultaneously observes, interacts, and interprets[15]—is always bound to be inflected by the researcher's personality and personal history. Objectivity, cultural anthropologists began to admit in the 1960s, is an illusion that, if reified, becomes ethically precarious. Hence, the practice of researcher reflexivity has been installed as a standard practice in ethnographic field research and writing.[16]

---

[15] On this dynamic of ethnographic fieldwork, see Rolf Lindner, "Die Angst des Forschers vor dem Feld: Überlegungen zur teilnehmenden Beobachtung als Interaktionsprozess," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 77 (1981): 51–66; Brigitta Schmidt-Lauber, "Seeing, Hearing, Feeling, Writing: Approaches and Methods from the Perspective of Ethnological Analysis of the Present," in *A Companion to Folklore*, ed. Galit Hasan-Rokem and Regina F. Bendix, trans. Andreas Hemming (Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 559–78.

[16] Marilyn Strathern explains the importance and functioning of researcher reflexivity thus: "Anthropologists' preoccupations take a typical two-fork turn. They argue about how to interpret the meaning of the actions, artifacts, words, and so on produced by the people they study, understood as values and qualities that people thereby represent to themselves. Simultaneously, they argue about how the ethnographer represents these meanings in the art of writing. The very activity of 'representation' is further queries in the current critique that no more nor less than the people he or she studies can the ethnographer occupy a position outside his or her productions. Writing is much more, in this view, than the recording of facts and observations. Consequently, the ethnographer can no longer present to be a neutral vector for the conveying of information; her or his own participation in the constructed narrative must be made explicit." Marilyn Strathern, *Partial Connections* (Savage, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1991), 7. Strathern goes on to paraphrase Stephen Tyler's contribution to this debate, in which he argued that representation in ethnography is in fact impossible. The ethnographer cannot represent another society or culture, but can only provide the reader with a connection by evoking a response. Stephen A. Tyler, *India: An Anthropological Perspective* (Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland, 1986), 128–131. See also George E. Marcus, *Ethnography Through Thick and Thin* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1998).

Not only did the interviews reveal certain patterns of discourse concerning these sites of translation, they also directed me to published sources that, I found out, clearly mirror these patterns. I am thus working with a multimodal corpus. Because of the turn to historical questions of how discourses and structures change symbiotically over time, ultimately the interviews will play a less significant role in the present exposition than I had originally thought they would. My references to key interviews and participant-observation appear mainly in Chapters 3 and 7 to confirm current patterns of discourse and thinking about the field's present and future structures, which are also reflected in published works. The rest of the chapters contain few if any references to interview data, aside from confirming which key texts or moment in postwar disciplinary history were identified by my interlocutors as still relevant today and in what contexts.

There is, however, a second reason for limiting my direct use of interview sources that has to do with an aspect of doing ethnographic research within expert communities.[17] While ethnographers must always maintain an awareness of the power differential between themselves and their interlocutors, in the case of expert communities, the power dynamic is often the opposite—or at least, more ambiguous—than in the classic anthropological paradigm of working in communities that are, in broad geopolitical, but also often more local terms, not strongly invested with power. This fact was a provocation for the "reflexive turn" in anthropology, yielding a reimagining of field methodology and ethnographic writing standards meant to create greater parity. [18] In

[17] On the unique fieldwork circumstances and practical considerations involved in the ethnography of expert communities, see Dominic Boyer, "Thinking through the Anthropology of Experts," *Anthropology in Action* 15, no. 2 (2008): 38–46. For the classic articulation of the turn in ethnographic research to communities and individuals in positions of power, see Laura Nader, "Up the Anthropologist: Perspectives Gained from Studying Up," in *Reinventing Anthropology*, ed. Dell H. Hymes (New York: Vintage, 1972), 284–331.

[18] Reflexivity, simply stated, problematizes the positionality of the ethnographer toward her/his interlocutors, both in field research and in ethnographic writing. As anthropologist Marilyn Strathern explains, the basic problem is the "elision between fieldworker, writer and author." She goes on to explain

the late 1960s, there came a turn in American cultural anthropology toward studying communities invested with power. This implied, in part, the possibility of "anthropology at home,"[19] whereby the north Atlantic sphere, North America and Europe, became acceptable sites of research. But more than this, it became more common for anthropologists to study within communities invested with power, including expert communities.[20]

This was the case for my fieldwork. However, in practice, my positionality was somewhat ambiguous. On the one hand, I was a student interviewing professors—a clear power differential. But on the other hand, I am an American (and hence, associated with the hegemonic anthropological tradition) interviewing Germans (who are aware that American anthropologists undervalue or are simply unaware of their work), and an anthropologically trained Germanist talking to professional anthropologists (someone with a base knowledge of, but no professional identity in the field). To operate within an ethics of reflexivity, then, entails acknowledging one's positionality vis-à-vis the community in question, recognizing the often uneven power relations that may affect access and communication, and respecting the interlocutors' rights to have a say in how their behavior and speech, as observed by the ethnographer, are represented in written ethnography.

---

the ideal held by the anthropological community of how to resolve this classic problem: "The kind of author one should be . . . has to be settled in terms of the relationships established in the field, the audiences one wishes to reach, the messages at stake. It cannot be settled by the authority of the fieldworker who was there." Strathern, *Partial Connections*, 9.

[19] George Marcus discusses this turn in terms of interdisciplinary connections with cultural studies and American Studies. George E. Marcus, "Repatriating an Interpretive Anthropology: The American Studies / Cultural Criticism Connection," *American Anthropologist* 85, no. 4 (1983): 859–65.

[20] See, for example, Bruno Latour, *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987); Paul Rabinow, *French Modern: Norms and Forms of the Social Environment* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1989); Hugh Gusterson, *Nuclear Rites: A Weapons Laboratory at the End of the Cold War* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996); George E. Marcus and Fernando Mascarenhas, *Ocasião: The Marquis and the Anthropologist, a Collaboration* (Walnut Creek, Calif.: AltaMira, 2005).

That being said, I encountered a challenge in my fieldwork that, I suspect, is in part a function of working with an expert community. But it is also related to characteristics of this particular community and my relationship to it. *Volkskunde* in Germany is a relatively small community with a fraught past that resulted in internal fracturing that persists to this day. Given these circumstances, interviewees sometimes shared with me frustrations they have about the field today in terms of bureaucratic pressures, conflicting knowledge structures, and professional relations. This would pose a problem to writing, I quickly realized, as most interviewees expressed awareness of—and even anxiety about—the fact that, even if I were to try to anonymize their contributions, they would have to be framed in such a way that it would be easy for readers in the field to figure out who said what. Indeed, several interlocutors scoffed at my offer to anonymize, stating that their standing in the field was great enough that it would be impossible to hide their identities, regardless of the framing.[21]

As a result, when a pattern emerged of interviewees revealing to me public secrets that they nonetheless did not wish to have attributed to them specifically, I decided it would be most appropriate to restrict my direct use of interview materials to a few key interlocutors, and otherwise rely mainly on the published sources to which interviewees directed me that already capture in a public way their thinking about the issues I am examining.[22] When I discuss general patterns of discourse, however, the reader can

[21] Teresa Brinkel describes experiencing a similar phenomenon when conducting oral history interviews for her historiography of East German *Volkskunde*. For instance, she describes how, when dealing with a disciplinary history fraught with taboos and emotions still felt strongly by many of those who lived it, some interlocutors were at times antagonistic, especially with respect to her qualifications (like me, a PhD student at the time) and prior knowledge (or lack thereof) of the field she was researching. Teresa Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR: Zur Geschichte eines Faches und seiner Abwicklung*, Studien zur Kulturanthropologie / Europäische Ethnologie 6 (Münster: LIT, 2012), 16–19.

[22] Indeed, it even appeared unnecessary to cite interviews with some of the best-established figures in the field, since, as many of them pointed out to me, if I had read what they had written, I would have already known the answers to the questions I was asking them. This is also a phenomenon Brinkel experienced in her fieldwork. Ibid., 18.

assume that I have observed these across all (or virtually all) modes in my corpus, including interviews and conversations that took place during participant-observation.

In analyzing the discursive patterns found in my interviews, my field notes from participant-observation, the published sources that those yielded, published sources with which I was already familiar from earlier research on the history of the field, and further sources discovered while cross-referencing all of these, I sought to map the circulation and transformations of a set of disciplinary tropes, for West-, East-, and reunified German *Volkskunde*, produced between 1945 and the present. As mentioned previously, my published sources include monographs, edited volumes, conference proceedings, journal articles, and institute websites. These sources, furthermore, encompass a variety of genres and purposes, including (auto)biographies and *Festschriften*, programmatic statements, documents of internal debates, and narratives directed toward the public, governmental bodies, and other outside, but invested constituencies.[23]

The procedure I follow in my analysis is structured by the following research questions:

1) How are key disciplinary events or ruptures identified and described in the historiography? More specifically, what narrative patterns or tropes appear most prevalently as structuring those narratives?
2) How are these ruptures rewritten or translated across time, in reaction to new developments inside and outside the field, and for different audiences?

[23] This combination of inward- and outward-directed historiographic sources reflects Mitchell Ash's analytical model for studying how the field of psychology narratively builds its claims for scientific legitimacy and standing in the hierarchy of disciplines. Mitchell G. Ash, "The Self-Presentation of a Discipline: History of Psychology in the United States Between Pedagogy and Scholarship," in *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*, ed. Loren R. Graham, Wolf Lepenies, and Peter Weingart, Sociology of the Sciences 7 (Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1983), 144.

3) To what extent do these writings resonate with contemporaneous public discourse and current scholarship concerning German history and identity?
4) In what ways does disciplinary historiography, in undergoing these translations, have tangible effects for how German *Volkskundler* / *Europäische Ethnologen* practice their field and understand themselves as a scientific community (epistemic structures), but also for how this community is structured in terms of research and educational institutions, professional organizations, funding bodies, and other organizational structures?

In other words, this study took its final shape by in turning to a concern for how historiographic tropes organize not only discursive performance of disciplinary identity, but the very structures which comprise the discipline as a recognizable field of knowledge and practice. The theoretical underpinnings for this approach, and its situatedness with respect to existing approaches to critical historiography and the history of science, will be the topic of the next chapter.

Though there may be other tropes that organize the historiography of postwar German *Volkskunde*, this analysis will focus on two that best exemplify what this case might offer for others, as well as for our understanding of the German situation. The first is *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, referring to the social processes involved in coping with Germany's history under National Socialism. Implied in this trope is the fundamentally important, but sometimes perilous boundary between science and the state, but also between science and the public understood as another target of official discourse and state intervention. The second trope is that of boundaries (in the sense of demarcations), specifically those between *Volkskunde* and neighboring specialist fields within and outside of Germany. The analysis ultimately arrives at the conclusion that this trope of boundary erection and -transgression is beginning to supersede or absorb the trope of

Vergangenheitsbewältigung and its implied thematization of the boundary between science and nonspecialist fields.

The central arguments of this dissertation with respect to these tropes are that they:

1) can be understood as operating through discursive performances by *Volkskundler* for the social fields (disciplinary, public, national, international, etc.) to which they belong;[24]
2) operate in part by selecting particular aspects of the discipline's past and framing them as either negative or positive contributions to its present and potential status with respect to specialist and nonspecialist fields; and
3) serve a legitimating function for a discipline that from its origins has been self-consciously precarious in its legitimacy as an independent field.

A fourth element of analysis frames the functioning of the tropes of institutional memory in terms of translation, namely, how they:

4) are translated across succeeding historical events or ruptures and various boundaries between cultural / discursive fields, but are also translated (or inscribed) into disciplinary epistemic and organizational / bureaucratic structures, that is, function to form institutional memory.

Before discussing precedent studies within which the present project is situated, the next section will present a brief overview of the "standard" history of the field to orient the reader, with the understanding that this narrative itself will be the subject of critical analysis for this project.

---

[24] These social fields can be political formations like the German nation-state and European Union, but also subcultural formations like national, European, and global scientific communities. The audiences within these spheres furthermore may be specialist, novice specialist (university students), nonspecialist publics, and professional but nonspecialist bodies of power (e.g., federal research funding bodies).

DELIMITING *VOLKSKUNDE*: THE STANDARD HISTORY

As with the study as a whole, the brief account of *Volkskunde*'s history that I offer here to orient the reader less familiar with the German situation limits its scope according to two criteria. The first is a focus on the German, as opposed to the Germanophone case. While there are many historical and present confluences among the German, Swiss, and Austrian traditions, which are often treated together in historiographies, given the scope of the present study, this outline will focus on the German case, including the East German tradition. Second, although the historical and present formations of the field include popular and professional organizations, museums, and research and teaching institutions, the focus here will be on *Volkskunde* in the university setting.

This section presents, first, *Volkskunde*'s mid-eighteenth-century philosophical roots, and then the circumstances of its assembling as a discrete scientific discipline in the mid-nineteenth century. It will next outline major lines of theory and methodological practices that came to define the field from the late nineteenth century to the present. It will also describe its relationship to neighboring fields, as this is an important touch point both in the history of the field and in the present study's analysis.[25]

While some histories of the field trace its beginnings as far back as Herodotus's establishment of world historiography and cultural description based on his travel experiences, German *Volkskunde*'s philosophical roots are typically identified as growing out of the Enlightenment (for Germany, beginning in the mid-1700s), when the term

[25] This description draws from key contemporary works on the history of *Volkskunde*, including Wolfgang Kaschuba, *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1999); Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, Andreas C. Bimmer, and Siegfried Becker, *Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie: Eine Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, 3. vollständig überarbeitete und aktualisierte Auflage, Sammlung Metzler 79 (Stuttgart: Metzler, 2003); Hermann Bausinger, *Volkskunde: Von der Altertumsforschung zur Kulturanalyse* (Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1999); Rolf Wilhelm Brednich, *Grundriß der Volkskunde: Einführung in die Forschungsfelder der Europäischen Ethnologie* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1994).

Volkskunde was first introduced in the context of descriptions of cultural practices—songs and poetry, religious observation, mythology, and other local customs and day-to-day habits—in regional travel literature and linguistic and historical research. Figures associated with these emerging documentation practices, and the humanistic interpretation thereof, include Josef Mader (1754–1815) and Carl Julius Weber (1767–1832), but most famously Jacob (1795–1863) and Wilhelm Grimm (1786–1859). In this way, *Volkskunde* shares roots with the fields of German literature and linguistics (*Germanistik*) and cultural history (*Kulturgeschichte*).

This was also the period when the notion of *Völkerkunde* emerged as another description of studying human cultural and racial features. Dieter Haller traces the roots of this parallel cultural science to the confluence of philosophical and physical anthropology (*Anthropologie*) associated with philosophers Immanuel Kant (1724–1804), Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803), and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831), and natural scientist Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752–1840).[26] World exploration, associated with Alexander von Humboldt (1769–1859) and Georg Forster (1754–1794), for instance, but also European projects of colonialism and imperialism provided the foreign objects and information around which collection practices and anthropological theorizing developed.

While both *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* revolved around other Enlightenment-era notions—*Kultur* (culture), *Rasse* (race), *Volksgeist* (the spirit of a people), and *Nation* (nation), most prominently—their usages began to diverge such that *Völkerkunde* would become associated with studying cultural *difference*, and *Volkskunde* would entail the study of the Germanic *Volk*. Both were thus invested in the rise of German ethnic

[26] Dieter Haller, *Die Suche nach dem Fremden: Geschichte der Ethnologie in der Bundesrepublik 1945–1990* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2012), 31–33.

nationalism, but from different angles. Their distinct foci were solidified in the mid-nineteenth-century Romantic period, when *Volkskunde* began to be conceived of as a scientific discipline for collecting and transmitting encyclopedic knowledge of the German people as part of a nation-building project. Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl (1823–1897) is still remembered as the father of scientific *Volkskunde*. As will be discussed in the historiographic analysis, however, his place in institutional memory is ambiguous.[27] For, as German historian George Mosse observes in his interpretation of the intellectual origins of National Socialism, it was "Riehl's writings [that] became normative for a large body of *völkisch* thought. . . . he constructed a more completely integrated *völkisch* view of man and society as they related to nature, history, and landscape."[28]

Despite Riehl's efforts to establish *Volkskunde* as a legitimate, independent academic discipline (*Wissenschaft*),[29] the field remained mainly a novice enterprise organized by semiprofessional folklore studies groups and journals, but with an institutional presence in the university setting limited to a subspecialization of a handful

---

[27] As the third edition of Ingeborg-Weber Kellermann's chapter on Riehl states, he was an "umstrittene Grundfigur" (controversial founding figure). Weber-Kellermann, Bimmer, and Becker, *Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie*, 49–62.

[28] George L. Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich* (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1964), 19.

[29] Frequently translated into English as "science," *die Wissenschaft* is better understood in the broader sense of scholarship or learning, that is, the systematic advancement of knowledge through research and teaching. With the indefinite article, *eine Wissenschaft* can refer to any organized body of information, or what one might call a field of knowledge. Paired with the concept of *Bildung*—the pursuit of learning for the intellectual and cultural "shaping" of the individual—this idea of *Wissenschaft* formed the basis of nineteenth-century German higher education reform as conceived by Wilhelm von Humboldt, Friedrich Schleiermacher, Gottlieb Fichte, and others associated with German Idealism.

For an exposition on the specific meaning of *Wissenschaft* in the history of German science, see Fritz K. Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890–1933* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969)., especially Chapter 2. For a review of important contributions to the history of Humboldt's model of the university, see Rüdiger vom Bruch, "A Slow Farewell to Humboldt? Stages in the History of German Universities, 1810–1945," in *German Universities, Past and Future: Crisis or Renewal?*, ed. Mitchell G. Ash (Oxford: Berghahn, 1997), 3–27; Dorle Dracklé, "Farewell to Humboldt? Teaching and Learning Anthropology in Germany," in *Educational Histories of European Social Anthropology*, ed. Dorle Dracklé, Iain R. Edgar, and Thomas K. Schippers (New York: Berghahn, 2003), 56–68.

of history professors. As Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann documents, the field's path to an independent identity was carved through and between a variety of other established and nascent fields of comparative cultural science and their respective theories of the individual and society, including philology, psychology, and religious studies. It was also influenced by a variety of social movements, including the *Heimatschutzbewegung* (homeland protection movement) and political anti-Semitism in the late 1800s.[30]

In the early 1900s, *Volkskunde* began to take on a more formal professional, academic identity. A central professional organization was founded in 1904: the Verband der Vereine für Volkskunde, which in 1963 was renamed the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde. Specific degree programs and *Volkskunde* professorships were introduced in the Weimar era between the end of World War I and the establishment of a National Socialist government in 1933.[31] This was the beginning of the first generation of professional *Volkskundler*, led by figures like Adolf Spamer (1883–1953), Julius Schwietering (1884–1962), and Hans Naumann (1886–1951) who introduced the first field-specific theories of culture, though not simply of the "folk" or peasantry, the native other of modern German society, but of the *Volk*, the whole German people.[32]

A solid body of intradisciplinary research[33] has demonstrated how elements of these theories were assumed into National Socialist cultural ideology. Especially attractive to the Nazi cultural ministry (Reichserziehungsministerium) were Naumann's

---

[30] Weber-Kellermann, Bimmer, and Becker, *Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie*, 63–96.

[31] In 1932, there were only two *Volkskunde* professorships in Germany: an *Ordinariate* in Hamburg (established 1923) and an *Extraordinariat* in Dresden (established 1926).

[32] Jean-Louis Georget, "Welche Zukunftsaussichten hat die Volkskunde? Eine Wissenschaft zwischen deutscher Nostalgie und europäischer Offnung," in *Das Populäre: Untersuchungen zu Interaktionen und Differenzierungsstrategien in Literatur, Kultur und Sprache*, ed. Olivier Agard, Christian Helmreich, and Hélène Vinckel-Roisin (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 269–270.

[33] See especially the historiographic sources cited in Chapters 2 and 3 of the present work.

notions of "*primitive Gemeinschaftskultur*" (primitive communal culture) and "*gesunkenes Kulturgut*" (sunken cultural goods).[34] These cultural concepts established a class-based analytical system whereby the origin of folklore is understood not as the peasantry (*Unterschicht*), but rather as an upper class (*Oberschicht*) whose creative products the unsophisticated lower class (poorly) imitated.[35] Naumann's theory was especially useful for supporting an ideology of the "master race" (*Herrenvolk*). The major teachings of the National Socialist period, as they relate to *Volkskunde*, have been summarized by Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann as follows:

1) the superiority of the Nordic race and the elite nature of brotherhoods,
2) the high value of war-making, and
3) the mission of expanding Germanic-German rule, which included a program for the research of the archeology and history (*Ahnenerbe*) of the Aryan race.[36]

It is with respect to the third pillar that *Volkskundler* were engaged in assembling, and inventing,[37] knowledge of Germanic culture in direct service to the state through projects—like the preexisting *Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde*—housed at universities, but also through the Reichsinstitut für Volkskunde. Although the first professors of *Volkskunde* had been appointed during the Weimar Republic, until the National Socialist period, most university *Volkskundler* still taught as lecturers or honorary professors

---

[34] James Dow notes that Nauman's term, "*gesunkenes Kulturgut*," is rarely translated out of the German original. Dow himself uses the gloss "sunken goods." James R. Dow, "Hans Naumann's Gesunkenes Kulturgut and Primitive Gemeinschaftskultur," *Journal of Folklore Research* 51, no. 1 (2014): 49. Alternative translations of "*gesunkenes Kulturgut*" that Dow mentions include "cultural lag," "abased cultural values," "degenerated imitations," and "debased elements of culture." But, as Dow further notes, while these translations present the concept negatively, at the time of its coinage, German scholars considered it to be simply descriptive. Ibid., 50.

[35] Thomas A. Green, *Folklore: An Encyclopedia of Beliefs, Customs, Tales, Music, and Art* (Westport, Conn.: ABC-CLIO, 1997), 419–420.

[36] Weber-Kellermann, Bimmer, and Becker, *Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie*, 122.

[37] The broader implications of this aspect of National Socialist-era *Volkskunde* are discussed at various points throughout the dissertation. See especially the introduction to the "*Folklorismus-Debatte*" in Chapter 3.

seated in other disciplines, such as *Germanistik*, *Kulturgeschichte*, theology, and music.[38] It was through its engagement by the Nazi regime that *Volkskunde* became firmly institutionalized as an independent, professional scientific discipline with dedicated faculties and research institutes.

Precisely for that reason, as the dissertation will elaborate, a great deal of attention was given to dealing with the implications of the field's past under National Socialism. Among the after-effects of *Volkskunde*'s fascist associations was a reluctance to engage in theorizing about culture, and a strong turn instead to establishing a set of rigorous, empirical research methodologies.[39] As Chapter 2 will examine, the history of the present form of *Volkskunde* is typically traced not to the Nazi period, but to the explosion of intradisciplinary criticism thereof in the 1960s/70s. It was at that point that the commitment to empirical methodology solidified, with areas of specialization diverging along a set of orientation branches. At the same time, from 1945 until 1989/90, East Germany developed a parallel tradition of *Volkskunde*, remembered in Cold War-era and postreunification historiography as being dedicated mainly to workers' culture analyzed with Marxist-Leninist theories of historical materialism. But, as well shall see in Chapter 4 and 5, this standard description of East German *Volkskunde* is still a fraught issue of institutional memory.

Among the key methods and areas of research analysis of contemporary *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* are material culture (from architecture to handicraft), visual culture, music, and narrative, pursued through archival research and

---

[38] Hannjost Lixfeld, *Folklore and Fascism: The Reich Institute for German Volkskunde*, ed. James R. Dow (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), 12; Wolfgang Emmerich, *Zur Kritik der Volkstumsideologie* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1971), 111.

[39] The progression of this structural impact will be discussed in Chapters 1, 2, and 3. For a summary of the issue, see James R. Dow, "There Is No Grand Theory in Germany, and for Good Reason," *Journal of Folklore Research* 45, no. 1 (2008): 55–62.

ethnographic field research (interviewing, participant-observation, oral history, etc.). The main framework of research in these modes is the composition and comparison of everyday life and its implications for cultural and social identity. This fundamental notion of culture is examined from various angles including the family, economy, law, medicine, gender, intercultural contact and conflict, knowledge systems, as well as the classic interest in customs (*Sitte und Brauch*). Theorization, meanwhile, draws heavily from non-German sources, especially French and Anglophone anthropology, sociology, and cultural studies.[40]

These are the high points of the standard history of *Volkskunde* as it appears across a variety of introductory texts. However, the most prominent historians of *Volkskunde* from within the field are quick to point out that no master history has been written yet.[41] The reasons for this lack of a master narrative will be elaborated in the course of the present study.

ORGANIZATION OF THE DISSERTATION

Before proceeding to the substantive analysis, the next chapter will present in more detail how this study is situated across existing critiques, and so further contributes to a certain set of established theoretical models and paradigms. The analytical frameworks assembled for this study include classic models of history of science studies, but also critical historiography, translations studies, and memory studies, among others.

---

[40] This outline of the field's main lines of research are drawn from Silke Göttsch and Albrecht Lehmann, eds., *Methoden der Volkskunde: Positionen, Quellen und Arbeitsweisen der Europäischen Ethnologie*, 3. überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 2007).

[41] Regina F. Bendix, "From 'Volkskunde' to the 'Field of Many Names': Folklore Studies in the German-Speaking Europe since 1945," in *A Companion to Folklore*, ed. Galit Hasan-Rokem and Regina F. Bendix (Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 365; Kaschuba, *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*, 15; Weber-Kellermann, Bimmer, and Becker, *Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie*, vi.

Together they yield the central theoretical concepts organizing this study. The first is "institutional memory," which captures the symbiosis of disciplinary historiography (i.e., narrative identity performances) and the discipline's epistemic and organizational structures, both of which are organized via a culturally and historically specific set of tropes. The second is "translation," used to refer to the different ways in which the tropes in question come to organize discourses and structures across social fields.

Following the "Study Frameworks" chapter, the substantive analysis is undertaken then in three main parts. Part I unpacks how the dominant trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* has been translated across *Volkskunde*'s postwar institutional memory in conversation with public discourses about Germany's past under National Socialism. As such, the chapter is organized according to the standard periodization of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* discourse in Germany. Chapter 1 examines the period between 1945 and the early 1960s, characterized by discursive performances that encompassed both defensiveness and critique, but most of all silence regarding the dire significance of the recent past for the discipline's present and future. Chapter 2 centers on the eruption of disciplinary self-criticism surrounding West Germany's antiauthoritarian revolution of the 1960s/70s and the tangible effects of this radical rewriting of the field's self-narrative for its epistemic and organizational structuring. Chapter 3 charts the last waves of *Volkskunde*'s *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, culminating in an exposition of how this central trope of institutional memory may be approaching the end of its meaningfulness as the discipline, like Germany itself, approaches a state of normalcy.

In light of this development, the remainder of the dissertation turns to exposing an alternative trope of institutional memory that until recently has been eclipsed by *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, namely, a trope of boundaries. This trope encompasses not only the problematic relationship between science and the state, but the relationship

between two German states' sciences, and between Germany's *Volkskunde* and other specialist cultural fields, national and international. Part II thus takes up the institutional memory of East German (GDR) *Volkskunde*, examining, first, narrative performances by and about that field during the Cold War years (Chapter 4), and second, how that branch of the field became a case of institutional forgetting and then contested memory after German reunification in 1989/90 (Chapter 5). At the same time, the case of GDR *Volkskunde* demonstrates how international and interdisciplinary boundary-maintenance and -transgression is a basic trope of institutional memory, before and after the fall of the Wall.

Part III performs an act of recursion by returning to sources discussed in Parts I and II to demonstrate how *Volkskunde*'s postwar institutional memory, though unquestionably organized by the trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, was also organized at the same time by the trope of boundaries. Chapter 6 revisits the period 1945–1989 to reread previously discussed sources within a boundaries framework and to introduce other sources from that period that, due to the dominance of the *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* trope into the 1990s, were not readily inscribed into institutional memory until more recently. Finally, Chapter 7 traces manifestations of the boundary trope in the institutional memory—that is, the historiographic narratives and disciplinary structures—of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* from German-German reunification to the present, and concluding with speculation about coming translations in institutional memory as the field engages ever more with its specialist neighbors to construct its identity.

As stated, this case study does not attempt to offer a master history of Germany's *Volkskunde* after 1945, but, quite the contrary, to offer a meta-analysis of the functioning of its institutional memory. In examining a multimodal corpus of sources written,

revalued, and/or redeployed over the course of the last seventy years, the following analysis will reveal how institutional memory is effectively a matter of translating organizing tropes: between the discourses and structures of a scholarly field; between that field and other social fields—public and specialist, German and international; and across successive social ruptures—from the "1968" antiauthoritarian movement, to the end of the Cold War, to the ever-accelerating global flow of goods, persons, and ideas. In this way, the study is not a contribution to the history of science so much as a methodological exercise in critical historiography meant to provoke greater reflexivity in the history of German science and society.

Study Frameworks

The methodological and theoretical frameworks employed in this metastudy of German *Volkskunde*'s post-1945 historiography draw from a variety of disciplines that each take on the question of the production and use of scholarly knowledge in its own way, yet often with significant overlaps in aims and strategies of explanation. These approaches include history, philosophy, and sociology of science; critical historiography; critical discourse analysis; memory studies; translation studies; performance studies; and ethnography. My synthesis rests on earlier studies of the history and historiography of German scientific disciplines, including *Volkskunde*, which have variously employed one or more of these approaches. Yet this study expands on these diverse perspectives to build an analytical framework through which to inquire not only into a single discipline, but also to build a more comprehensive approach to disciplinary histories.

In proceeding, therefore, this treatment focuses on three methodological perspectives that must be balanced against one another:

1) the purpose and stakes, both steady and dynamic, of disciplinary historiography,

2) how such inherently interested, often determinist historiography manipulates collective memory of the past and reinscribes it onto the epistemic and organizational structures of the discipline, and

3) how a specialist field's narrative performance of its own history interacts with broader identity discourses at the national and international levels.

By taking up methodological perspectives that have been applied in precedent discussions of disciplinary histories, this chapter sets the stage for the substantive analyses in Parts I, II, and III of the dissertation, the aim of which is then to provide a more comprehensive understanding of disciplinary history as part of a broader ideological field of cultural production. The theoretical framework assembled in this chapter will allow me to illuminate how critical moments in disciplinary histories in fact reflect interactions between *Volkskunde*'s particular history and the national historical events or ruptures that place the discipline under stress.

The present chapter begins by situating the study within the more traditional, transdisciplinary interests of works in the history, philosophy, and sociology of science. Next, I discuss how insights and analytical models from the critical historiography of scientific disciplines, but also critical historiography in more general cultural contexts, support the present study's central conceptual-methodological implication: that the history of scientific disciplines can and ought to be considered as a critical *cultural* historiography—namely, by examining how scientific disciplines intersect with the discourses of the dominant cultures which sponsor them. While precedent studies share this perspective,[42] what the present case study offers is a unique, hybrid approach undergirded by two anthropological concepts: trope and performance.

[42] The the circle of scholars around Wolf Lepenies who pursue the sociology of science adopt this perspective. Lepenies and Weingart observe, for instance, that "nowadays disciplinary histories become increasingly 'externalized,' i.e., . . . the discipline is no longer the frame of reference for the writing of its

Finally, in the concluding section of this chapter, I discuss how frameworks from interdisciplinary memory studies and translation studies can be viewed as useful analytical compliments to critical historiography's typical concern with the relationship among lived history, memory, and history-writing. For, it is via these additional interdisciplinary models that this study can add perspectives about the identity and epistemological politics of individual subjects and the implications of their positioning not only within disciplines but also other social fields (e.g., the German public and the international anthropological community, historical and present). The conceptual interventions enacted here on the one hand present a model for thinking about the interaction between the historiographic discourses and the institutional structures of a discipline. And, on the other hand, they offer a more nuanced alternative to notions like "legitimation,"[43] "fiction,"[44] or "sublimation,"[45] and other seemingly negative or pathologizing language often employed in critical historiography.

---

history but . . . its development is interpreted and explained in terms of the social and political environment in which it takes place." Wolf Lepenies and Peter Weingart, "Introduction," in *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*, ed. Wolf Lepenies, Peter Weingart, and Loren R. Graham, Sociology of the Sciences (Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1983), xvi. For this reason, the same authors conclude that "the 'social studies of science' are not really 'histories' of disciplines but systematic analyses which focus on the *conditions of the historicity* of scientific development." Ibid., xvii, emphasis added.

Perhaps the most prominent advocate of this perspective concerning the case of National Socialist-era and postwar West- and East German science is Mitchell G. Ash, who, in describing science and politics as "resources" for one another, offers an important alternative to the facile interpretation of German science as having been co-opted and thus corrupted by political forces. See Mitchell G. Ash, "Wissenschaft und Politik als Ressourcen für einander," in *Wissenchaften und Wissenschaftspolitik: Bestandsaufnahmen zu Formationen, Brüche und Kontinuitäten im Deutschland des 20. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Rüdiger vom Bruch and Brigitte Kaderas (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2002), 32–51; Mitchell G. Ash, "Verordnete Umbrüche—Konstruierte Kontinuitäten: Zur Entnazifizierung von Wissenschaftlern und Wissenschaften nach 1945," *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 43, no. 10 (1995): 903–23. Nonetheless, as the present study will reveal, the relationship between politics and science, although especially salient in the German case, is not the only boundary issue that frames the field's historiographic self-identification.

[43] Lepenies and Weingart, "Introduction," xv–xx.

[44] Hayden V. White, *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), 81–99. In describing historiography as a kind of "verbal fiction," White is emphasizing the perspectival and interpretive functioning of historiography. For, he claims, the consciousness of the historiographer—and the readers within society to which s/he belongs—"both constitutes and colonizes the world it seeks to inhabit comfortably." Ibid., 99.

A study using the proposed multi-layered framework can certainly reveal the particular ways in which German *Volkskundler* mobilized their field's history to reaffirm its legitimate existence to a variety of scientific and lay audiences in the face of a series of major societal ruptures—that is, to define itself reflexively as producing "legitimate science." However, this analytic approach also offers a means of understanding how a scientific field transacts change under conditions of historical-cultural stress not factored into monolithic notions like "paradigm shift" (associated with Thomas Kuhn), "falsifiablility" (associated with Karl Popper), or even Mitchell Ash's more recently proposed notion of science and politics as "resources" for one another, that have guided many historiographies of science to this point.

What I propose to consider, instead, is how disciplinary and cultural histories interact as multivalent, multidirectional "translations" between and among fields of discourse and action. In the situation of Germany's *Volkskunde* since 1945, three central tropes of postwar German national identity—*Vergangenheitsbewältigung* (i.e., ongoing references to Nazi-era *Volkskunde*), postwar political division (e.g., the political lines of the Cold War), and the boundaries between scientific communities (disciplinary and national)—structure the interface among various networks of power that influenced the production and circulation of knowledge and symbolic capital for *Volkskunde*—both in terms of the national and international scholarly community and in terms of *Volkskunde*'s presence in the public field on which postwar Germany was reinstating its own identity as a legitimate European and world political and economic power.

---

[45] Wolf Lepenies, *Das Ende der Naturgeschichte: Wandel kultureller Selbstverständlichkeiten in den Wissenschaften des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts* (Munich: Hanser, 1976), 207–208.

HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY, AND SOCIOLOGY OF SCIENCE

At the most basic level, this study grows out of interdisciplinary science studies. Yet in the Anglo-American context, a study of *Volkskunde* seems further away from the core of today's science studies because it is a discipline that straddles the humanities and social studies, rather than a laboratory science, which is the typical case study upon which theories and concepts in the history, philosophy, and sociology of science are built. Still, within the European context at least, the central question of how a field of knowledge is organized and reshaped over time is equally applicable to *Volkskunde*, and many contemporary studies of the field's history situate themselves within this tradition, as well.[46] French and German science studies, for instance, are less willing to consider science as spanning "two cultures," as C.P. Snow[47] defined it, because the human, cultural, social, and natural sciences are all *sciences*—systematic disciplines producing verifiable and reproducible knowledge.

To transfer these assumptions into the contemporary context of science studies, I assemble here key concepts from the history, philosophy, and sociology of science that allow one to understand Germany's *Volkskunde* as an institutionalized, specialized field of knowledge[48] defined as a "science" in terms of: 1) the field's epistemology (concepts, theories, and methods), 2) its institutional or organizational structures (universities,

---

[46] Recent examples include Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*; Antonia Davidovic-Walther and Michaela Fenske, "Exploring Ethnological Knowledges," *Journal of Folklore Research* 47, no. 1/2 (2010): 1–5. Amply more examples will be discussed in Chapter 3 with reference to a turn toward reflexive history of science within *Volkskunde* itself.

[47] C.P. Snow, *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1959).

[48] The question of how fields of knowledge are organized, bounded, and reshaped over time is central to any project in interdisciplinary science studies. However, surprisingly few such projects systematically account for the concepts used to build the narrative. Foundational works that introduced new models for understanding science offer a set of terms with which to begin. But by now the proliferation of theories constructed with reference to specific fields of knowledge (more often than not laboratory sciences) and the accompanying slippage among definitions of key concepts like "science" and "discipline" make for a fractured field of frameworks from which the science studies researcher must mindfully draw.

research institutes, publications, professional organizations, museums, and other physical spaces and bureaucratic bodies), and 3) the individual agents who occupy the field and so form a "scientific community." Among these agents are those who move beyond uncritical assumptions about the natural progress of science and the role of persons within the discipline to take on the reflexive role of disciplinary historians. As noted above, however, all of these constituent elements must be considered within the broader social and cultural contexts of German national society and history and international cultural anthropology.

Much of twentieth-century and twenty-first-century science studies research defines "disciplines" in terms of scientific logics—that is, the central ideas and practices of a community of knowledge specialists.[49] Perhaps the best known and most debated of

[49] My discussion of science studies will necessarily be limited to the theories most relevant to how I am examining the field of German *Volkskunde*. The field of science studies is much larger than what is covered in the present discussion and can be divided into three basic orientations. The first is the study of the epistemology or systems of knowledge, which involves following the evolution and shifting of theories, usually in terms of their logical consistency. This tradition reaches back to the mid-nineteenth-century efforts of Auguste Comte to institutionalize the history of science in the French academy. It is more readily associated, however, with the work of Karl Popper and others associated with the Vienna Circle (Feyerabend, Carnap, Russell, Frege), Thomas S. Kuhn in the mid-twentieth century, and Ian Hacking most recently. Besides Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, see especially Karl R. Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery* (New York: Basic, 1959).

The second most prominent approach today takes up poststructuralist epistemology, which examines the interface of knowledge systems and society, and is associated with twentieth-century French historians Gaston Bachelard, Georges Canguilhem, Michel Serres, and Michel Foucault. Key works in this tradition include Gaston Bachelard, *The Formation of the Scientific Mind: A Contribution to a Psychoanalysis of Objective Knowledge*, trans. Mary McAllester Jones (Manchester: Clinamen, 2002); Georges Canguilhem, *Ideology and Rationality in the History of the Life Sciences* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1988); Georges Canguilhem, *The Normal and the Pathological* (New York: Zone, 1989); Michel Foucault, *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception* (New York: Pantheon, 1973); Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* (New York: Pantheon, 1965); Michel Serres, *The Birth of Physics* (Manchester: Clinamen, 2000). This approach correlates the practices and institutions of science as knowledge production conditioned by the ideological and power premises of the societies which sponsor them.

The third, and most contemporary, approach to science studies today is the study of the social construction of scientific objects and facts—an epistemological critique of the concepts, nomenclature, and fundamental definitions of the object of science. This orientation toward practical and material culture is represented in the work of Andrew Pickering, Lorraine Daston, and Peter Galison, though Bruno Latour's sociology of science also fits this description. See for instance: Lorraine Daston, ed., *Biographies of Scientific Objects* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000); Lorraine Daston and Peter Galison,

these models is Thomas S. Kuhn's notion of scientific revolutions, which are "the tradition-shattering complements to the tradition-bound activity of normal science."[50] While Kuhn's notions of "normal science" and "paradigm"[51] are useful for describing the cohering, institutionalization, and everyday activity of a scientific community,[52] Kuhn's notions of paradigm shift and scientific revolution have been subject to rigorous critique for implying that scientific disciplines develop through an internally driven linear progression of discovery and achievement.[53]

Objectivity (New York: Zone, 2007); Andrew Pickering, *The Mangle of Practice: Time, Agency, and Science* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995); Bruno Latour, *The Pasteurization of France* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988); Bruno Latour and Steve Woolgar, *Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986); Latour, *Science in Action*.

[50] Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), 6.

[51] The organizing term with which Kuhn constructs his argument is "normal science," defined as "research firmly based upon one or more past scientific achievements, achievements that some particular scientific community acknowledges for a time as supplying the foundation for its further practice." Ibid., 10. More specifically, normal science comprises a body of accepted theories, laws, applications, and instrumentations which define the problems and methods of a research field. Kuhn's second key term is "paradigm," which he defines as those achievements that are both sufficiently unprecedented as to compete with other approaches to a problem, and sufficiently open-ended as to generate further problems for research. When a scientific community acquires a paradigm via firm consensus, it marks the maturation of a scientific field, i.e., the emergence of a profession, a discipline, a research tradition.

[52] "Normal science" and "paradigm" often have been used unproblematically in *Volkskunde*'s disciplinary historiography since the 1980s. See, for instance, Helge Gerndt, *Fach und Begriff "Volkskunde" in der Diskussion* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988), 2; Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*, 33; Vera Deißner, "Zur Geschichte volkskundlicher Fachgeschichtsschreibung bis 1931," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 93 (1997): 57–76. This usage might also be read as part of an international anthropological turn toward the Kuhnian paradigm concept among critical anthropologists beginning in the 1960s. See Bob Scholte, "Cultural Anthropology and the Paradigm-Concept: A Brief History of Their Recent Convergence," in *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*, ed. Loren R. Graham, Wolf Lepenies, and Peter Weingart, Sociology of the Sciences 7 (Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1983), 229–78.

[53] For a key articulation of the critique of Kuhn's model of scientific revolution, see Canguilhem, *Ideology and Rationality in the History of the Life Sciences*. For Canguilhem and his school, science does not develop via revolutions, but rather epistemological breaks or ruptures (11). A further argument against Kuhn is the implication of his model that science is autopoetic: driven from within, without the influence of outside forces. This notion resonates with Niklas Luhmann's systems theory of society, in that science is seen as a discrete social field in communication with other fields, yet fundamentally self-referential, providing it with clear-cut and secure boundaries. Niklas Luhmann, *Social Systems* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1995).

When viewed through the Kuhnian lens, a discipline like *Volkskunde* certainly does not appear to have developed as a linear series of internal paradigm shifts. Indeed, in many ways, the field of *Volkskunde* has continually struggled even to achieve an identity as "normal science" in terms of its most essential characteristic: the drawing together of a group of adherents around a paradigm that could compete with other models for the systematic production of knowledge aimed at understanding a particular field of objects.[54] From the field's origins at the margins of eighteenth-century philosophy, ethnology, and *Germanistik* until its ultimate institutionalization under Nazi sponsorship, *Volkskunde* was for a long time comprised of a loosely defined, at best regionally organized mix of hobbyists and experts from other fields. Even into the twenty-first century, the theories, methods, and the other elements associated with *Volkskunde* and its off-shoots are still understood as drawing from neighboring fields, especially ethnology, history (specifically Germany's tradition of *Kulturgeschichte*), *Germanistik*, and sociology, as well as other national traditions of cultural anthropology, in particular the Anglophone and the Scandinavian. Thus, if one were trying to isolate *Volkskunde*'s paradigm in the way that Kuhnian analysts prefer to do, one might say that the field's "normal science" was from the first in fact quite abnormal.

As the analyses across Parts I, II, and III of this dissertation will ultimately clarify, relations between *Volkskunde* and its neighboring fields form one overarching trope in the discipline's historiography. The mobilization of history for the epistemological and institutional construction of the field over against other fields of

[54] Kuhn's model of "normal science" or paradigm-based research is based mainly on the history of physics. While he presents his theory of scientific revolutions as applicable to any "mature science," it becomes clear that physics is the only discipline he considers a currently mature science fitting his model—mathematics and astronomy, biochemistry, and the social sciences are all excluded for having followed a different historical development. Indeed, Kuhn questions whether parts of social science even have a paradigm at all. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 15.

scientific knowledge will receive special attention in Parts II and III. But the problem of disciplinary boundaries will be raised already within the scope of Part I, which is dedicated to the trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in postwar German public discourse and how it affected the identity of *Volkskunde*. There, it will be shown that, rather than shoring up its paradigm, *Volkskunde* after Nazism fractured into its own set of competing modes of scientific activity, which some insiders and outsiders might even consider separate sciences. More significantly, at the point of *Volkskunde*'s rapid institutionalization under Nazi sponsorship, the scientific community converged not around a paradigm identifiable within their circle as fostering a valid and systematic production of knowledge, but rather in adopting politically defined and politically expedient sets of questions whose legitimacy depended on outside constituencies: the national government and national public. The influence of such extradisciplinary forces on the construction of a scientific field will be amplified in Part II, concerning *Volkskunde* in the GDR, and in Part III, concerning supranational political forces. But, as will be substantiated in the course of the study, the relationship between science and politics, though an important theme for histories of twentieth-century German science, is only one of several boundary issues affecting the field's narrative and structural construction.

Like most scientific fields, then, *Volkskunde* does not fit the Kuhnian model of linear, autopoetic disciplinary evolution. A more promising model for understanding the evolution of this science may be the one proposed by the French historian of science George Canguilhem. It is based on the opposite premise: Canguilhem and his circle, including Michel Foucault and Gaston Barchelard, see science as developing not via revolutions nor as evolutions of existing paradigms of logic and practice, but rather through what they call epistemic breaks or ruptures initiated by or initiating broader,

society-wide epistemic shifts.[55] This alternative epistemological interpretation initiated a sociological turn in the history of science that further redirected interest away from "normal science" as a monolithic body of approved knowledge and knowledge-producing practices evolving in neat linear progression. This new orientation embraced a more complex notion of science as one social field among others in a general sociohistorical context in which external and internal circumstances exert influence upon the actors themselves. Here, the makeup and evolution of a scientific field is not seen as simply comprising the collected and accepted objects, methods, and models of inquiry associated with the field. Rather, a scientific field evolves due to the social composition of knowledge communities, and to the influence of outside forces like neighboring fields, universities, governments, and other institutions, as well as to the competing institutional memories of a field's past.

A prominent example of this approach to science as part of a social field is French anthropologist Bruno Latour's studies of laboratory scientists and engineers.[56] But while his works add further dimensions to our understanding of scientific development, Latour focuses relatively narrowly on the construction of "scientific facts" within the social space of the research laboratory, with an orientation toward paradigm shift or scientific revolution very similar to Kuhn's. One of Latour's later works, *The Pasteurization of*

---

[55] Canguilhem, *Ideology and Rationality in the History of the Life Sciences*, 11. See also Bachelard, *The Formation of the Scientific Mind*; Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, trans. Alan M. Sheridan Smith (New York: Pantheon, 1972). A genealogy of this school of history of science can be found in Gary Gutting, *Michel Foucault's Archaeology of Scientific Reason* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

[56] Latour and Woolgar, *Laboratory Life*; Latour, *Science in Action*. Other forerunners in institution-oriented sociology of science include Robert King Merton, *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1973); Karin Knorr-Cetina, *The Manufacture of Knowledge: An Essay on the Constructivist and Contextual Nature of Science* (Oxford: Pergamon, 1981); Karin Knorr-Cetina and Michael J. Mulkay, *Science Observed: Perspectives on the Social Study of Science* (London: SAGE, 1983).

France,[57] offers a more flexible model that takes into account the effects of phenomena beyond the laboratory on the development of nineteenth-century French microbiology and the public hygiene movement. However, it remains indebted to the Kuhnian revolution model that centers on the laboratory as the location of scientific dynamism.[58] Thus, the transferability of this model to disciplines practicing different modes of "normal science" is also limited.

What a case like *Volkskunde* requires, then, is a broader definition of discipline, one that does not reduce the scientific field to an isolated, idealized "scientific community" or whose sole interest is the production of knowledge that reproduces a system of norms and values (or "paradigm") imposed by that community on its members as "normal science."

The principle alternative to a paradigm-driven understanding of science is a redefinition of "science" and "discipline" as kinds of "discursive formations,"[59] as proposed by Michel Foucault. Speaking in reference to one of his primary case studies, the history of psychiatry, Foucault defines "science" not just as a community of specialists, a social field, or a set of logics and practices that are presumed to generate knowledge. Instead, he defines it as what he terms a "discursive formation," a "defined structure of ideality" that is associated with notions of form and rigor as well as with its particular objects of inquiry, central concepts, strategies, and the kind of "enunciations" it uses.[60] In this sense, a discourse is defined not only by particular concepts, terms, or logics, but also by practices and the values ascribed to them due to historical conventions or inherited ideologies. A "discipline," as he expands on the basic notion, is a discursive

[57] Latour, *The Pasteurization of France*.
[58] See especially Ibid., 129–137.
[59] Foucault, *Archaeology*, 124–125.
[60] Ibid., 181–182.

formation that, while also defined by the groups of objects and methods central to its knowledge production, more importantly consists of a "corpus of propositions considered to be true, the interplay of rules and definitions, of techniques and tools." Together, these elements form "a sort of anonymous system, freely available to whoever wishes, or whoever is able to make use of them, without there being any question of their meaning or their validity being derived from whoever happened to invent them.[61] In other words, neither sciences nor disciplines are subject to the sole proprietorship of defined communities, but rather exist at the border between the scientific community and the general contexts in which the science is practiced, as a kind of worldview that systematizes and implements some elements which scholars of the Kuhnian persuasion have identified as belonging to science proper, and others that belong to society, historical tradition, or other (possibly temporary) conventional understandings.

It is critical to note that these discursive formations do not achieve their value specifically via claims to logical or procedural truth alone, but also to the history of its practice and to received understanding that can remain unquestioned. Expounding upon Canguilhem's notion of epistemic ruptures, Foucault clarifies that "a discipline is not the sum total of all truths that may be accepted, by virtue of some principle of coherence and systematization, concerning some given fact or proposition." Rather, disciplines "consist of errors as well as truths, errors that are in no way residuals, or foreign bodies, but having their own positive functions and their own valid history, such that their roles are often indissociable from that of the truths." The condition for a proposition to belong to a discipline is not simply that it be true, but that it "refer to a specific range of objects" and

[61] Ibid., 222. Integral to Foucault's thinking about discipline is his notion of the Normal, which across fields of discourse from law, to education, to science is established as a principle of coercion, standardization, and organization—in short, an instrument of power imposed by notions of what is "natural" to understand. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Pantheon, 1977), 184.

"fit into a certain type of theoretical field."[62] In short, a discipline consists most fundamentally in the range of discourse it permits (especially what questions become possible or habitual to ask, and what objects emerge as possible to address), and not necessarily in the truth value of such discursive formations as systems or logics of practice.[63]

These definitions of science and discipline relate closely to Foucault's notion of the "episteme" as a social-historical object, and not just a logical or professional one: it is a field of knowledge whose history is not a matter of rational value, objective forms, or aggregated achievements (i.e., the Kuhnian notion of "normal science"), but rather an archive of the *conditions of possibility* of its discursive forms.[64] This notion of the episteme is central to the methodology of this dissertation in that it further allows *Volkskunde* to be understood as one field of discourse whose history, and hence its historiography, is intertwined with those of other fields of discourse, scientific or otherwise.

Yet in viewing *Volkskunde* as a discipline interacting and variously overlapping with other discursive formations of postwar German society, this study operates with more than the ephemera of discourse alone; it is critical to keep the institutional structures and actors within view as well. To that end, it is useful to conceive of a discipline in more concrete terms, as a kind of subculture[65] operating on what Pierre Bourdieu calls a social

---

[62] Foucault, *Archaeology*, 223.

[63] Ibid., 222–224, see also Chapter 6, "Science and Knowledge" .

[64] Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Pantheon, 1971), xxii.

[65] One might also think of the field in terms of Dick Hebdige's notion of subculture. Dick Hebdige, *Subculture: The Meaning of Style* (Abingdon, U.K.: Taylor & Francis, 1979). Both concepts are an improvement over the concept of "scientific community" used in standard histories of science in that they draw attention to symbolic interaction as a key element for defining or disputing the boundaries of a field/subculture. However, as Hebdige's notion is associated specifically with subordinated groups, Bourdieu's more neutral notion of field is preferred for the purpose of this dissertation.

field[66] held in place by certain mental and behavioral habits (the "*habitus*"[67]) and characterized by an ideology guiding the distribution of value ("symbolic capital"[68]) within the field. The advantage of the Bourdieusian theory of social practice[69] over Foucault's theory of discourse and power for the present analysis is that it allows *Volkskunde* to be understood as a social field comprised of disciplinary paradigms, discursive formations, and institutional structures, on the one hand, and social actors on the other hand. By institutional structures I am referring to physical locations of sponsored scientific work, such as research institutes, universities, laboratories, and museums, and collectives such as professional organizations that formalize and pass down discursive formations and practices as part of their identity as "legitimate" or

---

[66] Pierre Bourdieu defines a "field" as a network of agents or collectives and the social positions these occupy, which themselves are formed by interactions within and between fields. See Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, ed. Randal Johnson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 30; see also chapter 1. See also Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984), see especially chapter 2.

[67] Bourdieu's definition of "*habitus*" is rather complex and so merits full citation. "*Habitus*" is "systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles of the generation and structuring of practices and representations which can be objectively 'regulated' and 'regular' without in any way being the product of obedience to rules, objectively adapted to their goals without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary to attain them and, being all this, collectively orchestrated without being the product of the orchestrating act of a conductor." Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 72. On the role of *habitus* and capital distribution for structuring a scientific field, see Pierre Bourdieu, "The Specificity of the Scientific Field and the Social Conditions of the Progress of Reason," in *The Science Studies Reader*, ed. Mario Biagioli (New York: Routledge, 1999), 35–37.

[68] "Capital," explains Bourdieu, "is a social relation, i.e., an energy which only exists and only produces its effects in the field in which it is produced and reproduced." Bourdieu, *Distinction*, 113. Examples of symbolic capital are prestige and honor. Bourdieu also speaks of cultural capital (knowledge, skills, and other cultural acquisitions accumulated through education). Both of these types of intangible capital are still tied to economic capital, as one of the key qualities of fields is how they permit one form of capital to be converted into another. See Ibid., 80–85; Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, 171–183.

[69] The key articulation's of Bourdieu's theory of practice may be found in Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*; Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, trans. John B. Thompson (Cambridge: Polity, 1991); Bourdieu, *Distinction*. For more specific applications, see also Pierre Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1990); Pierre Bourdieu and Jean Claude Passeron, *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*, SAGE Studies in Social and Educational Change 5 (London: SAGE, 1977); Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production*; Pierre Bourdieu, *Homo Academicus*, Le sens commun (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1984).

"authorized" producers of knowledge. Such structural elements of disciplines owe their existence to, and evolve through the actions of, not only the social actors who practice a discipline, but also the capital and ideological investments of hegemonic financing bodies, especially state-sponsored institutions such as the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD), and the Goethe-Institut.[70] The economic and symbolic capital bestowed by such arbiters of legitimate, "normal science" makes possible, and in turn helps to configure, scientific research programs and their evaluation, academic departments, degree plans or curricula, publishing organs and conferences—i.e., all of the sites of production of legitimate disciplinary knowledge and reproduction of the field itself.[71]

Still, discipline in Bourdieu's framework is not to be understood in dichotomous terms of institutional structure versus individual agency, but rather in terms of the dynamic relationship between practices and the contexts of practice, between mutually structuring objective fields of culture and the subject positions within them. All these elements are mutually implicating within a Bourdieusian field (a Foucauldian episteme that also includes consideration of individual motivations and values). The field on which a discipline plays out its production of knowledge thus may be defined as a network or hierarchy of objective relations constituted by institutions,[72] rules and values, categories

[70] The German Research Federation is a self-governing organization for science and research in Germany. It funds a wide array of research projects across the disciplinary spectrum, including interdisciplinary ventures and international cooperations. See http://www.dfg.de. The German Academic Exchange Service supports research cooperation between Germany and the U.S. and Canada through scholarships and grants at all levels of university education, from undergraduate to faculty. See https://www.daad.org/. Subsidized by the German Foreign Office and international partner organizations, the Goethe Insitute acts on behalf of the Federal Republic of Germany to encourage learning about German culture and language. See http://www.goethe.de/.

[71] For Bourdieu's thoughts on the functioning of capital specifically in the field of academia, see Bourdieu, *Homo Academicus*, especially chapters 2 and 3.

[72] Bourdieu uses institution in the specific sense, not of a particular organization, but as "any relatively durable set of social relations which *endows* individuals with power, status and resources of various kinds." John B. Thompson, "Editor's Introduction," in *Language and Symbolic Power*, by Pierre Bourdieu

and conventions, and the interactions between these and social practices within and across fields.[73] Moreover, the social fields encompassing disciplines also are constituted by the conflicts surrounding the definition and distribution of capital.

Scientific fields in particular are distinguished by certain stakes, namely the monopoly of scientific authority: a type of social capital which encompasses technical capacity and social power, scientific competence and prestige. An agent possessed of scientific authority is authorized by a field to speak and act legitimately in matters concerning that field or discipline. In other words, she or he is able to define the problems, methods, and theories of the discipline according to her own interests.[74] Thus, for scientific fields, one must consider conflicts of power and epistemology as constituting a field's structure at a given time, for it is the field itself that assigns the researcher—a member of a specialist class—her political and scientific problems and methods.

While this last aspect may suggest that a scientific field operates autonomously in isolation from other social fields, and while Bourdieu himself argues that scientific fields by their nature tend to be more autonomous than other kinds of social fields, it must be reiterated that, in contrast to isolationist models of social groups, like those proposed by

---

(Cambridge: Polity, 1991), 8. In this sense, a discipline or scientific community might be considered an institution. For the purpose of this dissertation, the term institution will be used to refer to particular organizations—university institutes, museums, scientific academies, professional societies, etc. Nonetheless, the authorizing and capital-distributing power Bourdieu ascribes to institutions characterizes these specific organizations also.

[73] The notion that scientific disciplines and other social fields / planes of discourse influence one another is not limited to Bourdieu's theorizing, but has permeated the sociology and anthropology of science. See, for instance, Helga Nowotny, Peter Scott, and Michael Gibbons, *Re-Thinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty* (Cambridge: Polity, 2001); Peter Weingart, *Die Wissenschaft der Öffentlichkeit: Essays zum Verhältnis von Wissenschaft, Medien und Öffentlichkeit* (Weilerswist: Velbrück Wissenschaft, 2005); Wolfgang Kaschuba, ed., *Wissensgeschichte als Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, vol. 4, Geschichte und Gesellschaft 34 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008).

[74] Bourdieu, "The Specificity of the Scientific Field," 31–34.

Kuhn (for sciences) and Niklas Luhmann[75] (for sociologically defined groups of professionals identifying as sharing a discipline), a field as Bourdieu defines it is by nature permeable. This is a significant factor overlooked in much traditional philosophy or history of science: that actors from neighboring fields—public and private funding bodies, university administration, neighboring academic disciplines, other national and international traditions of anthropology, the national public, the national government, international political relations, etc.—may also participate in and so affect the structure and organization of an individual discipline or science like Germany's *Volkskunde*, and vice versa. In tracing central themes in the discipline's postwar historiography, then, I will show that *Volkskunde* is in fact especially preoccupied with the discipline's interaction with other fields as a challenge and support to its legitimation as an independent scholarly field. In other words, the study of this discipline specifically implicates neighboring fields.[76]

---

[75] See, for instance, Luhmann, *Social Systems*.

[76] More recent work also expands on our notions of what the logic of a scientific discipline might mean. Bourdieu's notion of field and Foucault's notion of episteme are complimented by Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the plane of imminence. See Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *What Is Philosophy?*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 35–60. Both Bourdieu's and Foucault's models recognize that social fields or epistemes are permeable and subject to rupture. Deleuze and Guattari take this notion a step further in articulating the variety of ways in which planes are structured to interact. The behavior of planes is not simply a matter of boundaries abutting or overlapping, but also the fluid, dynamic, fractal, and fragmentary nature of planes themselves. They cannot be imaged as occupying successive positions in two-dimensional space; rather planes may be layered, float about, contain holes, extend roots and shoots—they are what Deleuze and Guattari also describe as rhizomatic—and intersect at multiple sites in a multitude of spatial-temporal directions. See Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), 3–25.

This comparison is mentioned in order to reiterate that when one considers *Volkskunde*, it must not be as an isolated, homogeneous social field, but as it intersects, transforms, and is transformed unevenly by other fields. For the case of *Volkskunde* in Germany, for example, these planes of imminence and their possible intersections and interactions include spaces controlled by neighboring disciplines, various scientific institutions, and other national traditions of anthropology, as well as the broader political fields of divided and reunified Germany, Europe, and global geopolitics in and beyond the East-West Cold War divide. If scientific disciplines in traditional accounts seem oriented toward boundaries, forming around authorized discourse and the accumulation of capital, then Deleuze and Guattari's notion of planes reminds us to examine disciplinary historiography with a critical eye toward what other fields—or discourse

Foucault's notions of episteme and discourse and Bourdieu's notion of field offer models for inquiring into the structures and interactions of scientific disciplines and the actors enmeshed in them. However, in order to further ground the totalizing implications of these theoretical constructs for the purposes of the present project, another set of critical analyses must be added to the assemblage of theoretical-methodological frameworks. The next section will thus examine scholarly precedents helpful for clarifying what is at stake in the diachronic or historical evolution of disciplines.

CRITICAL HISTORIOGRAPHY OF SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINES

Aimed at expanding on an understanding of science as resting upon history and historical inheritance, this section covers a constellation of perspectives, broadly designated critical historiography, that in recent years has emerged to extend the models of history, philosophy, and sociology of science discussed in the previous section—in particular, Foucault's studies of discourse and power within an archaeology of knowledge. These models, by reference to factors of interest to the humanities and interpretive social sciences, often add traditional or diachronic perspectives to the purer logical epistemology of the earlier models for science and disciplines. They range from social history (*historische Sozialgeschichte*)[77] and conceptual history (*Begriffsgeschichte*),[78] through literary criticism (reader-response theory [*Rezeptionsästhetik*],[79] in particular), narratology,[80] and critical discourse analysis.[81]

---

formations, epistemes, subcultures, planes—are implicated in their narratives, as spoken or unspoken, traditional or new, immediately obvious or more occasional intersections of planes of imminence.

[77] Representative of the Bielefeld School of social history is Jürgen Kocka, *Sozialgeschichte und Kulturanthropologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984).

[78] Most commonly associated with Reinhart Koselleck, *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1985).

[79] See, for instance, Hans Robert Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, trans. Timothy Bahti (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982); Hans Robert Jauss, "Literary History as a Challenge

The central assertions promulgated in what most often emerge as critical considerations of historiography[82] as a particular form of discourse (and often as master narratives of culture) address 1) the perspectival nature of history-writing and 2) the legitimating function of historiographic discourse. If brought into conversation with the previous section's exposition of Bourdieu's and Foucault's frameworks for understanding scientific disciplines as social and discursive formations, such studies in critical historiography would admit not only that a discipline or science operates on a field comprised of various structures and various forms of symbolic power associated with it, but also that disciplines further anchor themselves by recounting their own stories of origin, heroes, and breakthrough (and forgetting villains and failures) as a tactic of self-legitimatization.

The origins of critical historiography and the associated field of cultural criticism are frequently situated in the work of nineteenth-century German historian Jacob Burckhardt, specifically his *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* (1860).[83] Burckhardt recounts the history of the Italian Renaissance from the perspective of its

---

to Literary Theory," trans. Elizabeth Benzinger, *New Literary History* 2, no. 1 (1970): 7–37; Wolfgang Iser, *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974).

[80] See, for instance, Gérard Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1980); Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981); Mieke Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*, trans. Christine van Boheemen, 3rd ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009).

[81] Drawing heavily on the discourse theories of Foucault and Bourdieu, the basic premise of critical discourse analysis (CDA) is that language (written and spoken) as a kind of social practice functions to establish and maintain power relations. CDA seeks to understand how "discourse events" are "shaped by situations, institutions and social structures, but also shape them," and what the ideological (i.e., power) implications are. Norman Fairclough and Ruth Wodak, "Critical Discourse Analysis," in *Discourse as Social Interaction*, ed. Teun A. van Dijk (London: SAGE, 1997), 258. See also, Norman Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (London: Longman, 1995); Norman Fairclough, *Language and Power* (London: Longman, 1989); Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (London: SAGE, 2001).

[82] The German language makes a useful distinction between written history (*Geschichte*) and lived history (*Historie*) upon which theoreticians in the field of critical historiography frequently draw.

[83] Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* (New York: Harper, 1958).

dominant idea, as opposed to claiming to represent the period in its entirety as a reconstruction; he eschews the conventional plots of history writing as evolution in favor of a personally reflexive narrative model that stresses actors instead of greater historical forces. In making this shift away from an overarching account of historical process and toward an account of the actors in history, Burckhardt's historiography emphasizes the perspectival nature of all history writing and how it is based on certain images of historical actors, much as a visual artist offers a certain, personal perspective on an art object.

A century later, American historian Hayden White would take up Burkhardt's implicit critique of historiography in combination with classic accounts of the philosophy of history,[84] new trends in literary criticism,[85] and Foucault's archaeology in order to articulate an explicit critical theory of historiography as the study of ideologically implicated narratives that naturalize certain images of how and why history proceeds. White describes the historian's work as performing a "*poetic* act, in which he *pre*figures the historical field and constitutes it as a domain upon which to bear specific theories he will use to explain 'what was *really*' happening' in it."[86] Thus, according to White, all historiography reflects a particular philosophy of history—that is, an authorial position and an interpretation of what history-writing implies for creating meaning[87]—reflected in

---

[84] This includes the thought of Friedrich Nietzsche, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Karl Marx, and Benedetto Croce. See Hayden V. White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973); White, *Tropics of Discourse*.

[85] White makes explicit reference to the literary criticism of Northrop Frye and René Wellek. However, one can see resonances between White's critical historiography and the Konstanz School of reader-response theory surrounding Wolfgang Iser and Hans Robert Jauss, the basic premise of which is that the definition and interpretation of literature is always situated within cultural and historical context, and thus subject to change across audience and time. Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1957); René Wellek, *Concepts of Criticism* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1963); Iser, *The Implied Reader*; Jauss, "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory."

[86] White, *Metahistory*, x, emphasis original.

[87] White, *Tropics of Discourse*, chapter 2.

a certain narrative form,[88] none of which is more "realistic" than another.[89] In this sense, White views historiography not as a collection of historical facts that become ossified as a system revealing a truth about history, but as a literary artifact.[90]

This literary model for history-writing is not necessarily a negative one. Instead, the historian's work of narrative construction must be understood as part of the historical process—as a means of mediating among lived history (*Historie*), the historical record, other historical accounts, and an audience.[91] While White's analysis focuses on the side of the history-writer and proposes a seemingly universalist selection of narrative forms from which historians might choose,[92] his fundamental theory of the perspectival and constructed nature of historiography may be combined fruitfully with another interpretation of narrative from the same era: Hans Robert Jauss's notion of "horizon of expectation,"[93] which highlights the temporal and cultural situatedness of audience interpretation of such constructed narratives, as well.

---

[88] White elaborates three main narrative forms traditionally available to historians: explanation by emplotment, by formal argument, and by ideological implications. These narrative forms prefigure the historical field in question, and then operate through a poetics of tropes, which White describes in terms of the classical verbal models. Tropes in historiography serve to constitute the domain, its objects, the concepts used to describe them, and to characterize the relationship among them. White, *Metahistory*, 7–38. As White explains: "In the poetic act which precedes the formal analysis of the field, the historian both creates his object of analysis and predetermines the modality of the conceptual strategies he will use to explain it." Ibid., 31.

[89] White, *Metahistory*, x, emphasis original; xi–xii. White's critique of historiography clearly echoes Foucault's notion of enunciations gaining legitimacy not from its truth value but from its acceptance within an established field of discourse. Foucault, *Archaeology*, see especially 79–117. For White's own thoughts on the uses of Foucault's model for discourse analysis, see White, *Tropics of Discourse*, 231–260.

[90] White, *Tropics of Discourse*, 81–100.

[91] White, *Metahistory*, 5.

[92] The universalist tendency can be seen in White's reliance on child psychologist Piaget, Freud's dream interpretation, Leví-Strauss's anthropology of myth, and Frye's notion of the origin of literary conventions. White, *Tropics of Discourse*, 56–59.

[93] Jauss, "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory." This notion, furthermore, resonates well with Bourdieu's theory of social practice and Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the "ideal observer," which is defined as a perceiving and feeling (as opposed to acting) force installed in a system of reference. These are not social actors, per se, but the imagined perceivers of communicative action in a plane of immanence (or what Bourdieu would call a social field). Deleuze and Guattari, *What Is Philosophy?*, 128–133. One might also think of the ideal observer as akin to Iser's "implied reader" or Jauss's "horizon of

More recently, Dominick LaCapra addresses this issue by directing the attention of critical historiography to the context of writing and reception as an additional layer of critique. He states:

> Intellectual history shares with disciplines such as literary criticism and the history of philosophy . . . an initial focus upon complex written texts and a need to formulate as a problem what is often taken, deceptively, as a solution: the relationship between texts and their various pertinent contexts. It is only when the precise nature of this relationship is posited as a genuine problem that one will be able to counteract the dogmatic assumption that any given context—the author's intentions, a corpus of text, a genre, a biography, the economic infrastructure, modes of production, society and culture in some all-consuming and frequently circular sense, codes, conventions, paradigms, or what have you—is *the* context for the adequate interpretation of texts.[94]

LaCapra's argument—that the context of historiography includes not only the author's intentions (which in turn gestures toward positionality and stakes involved in creating the narrative), but also the source material, the target genre, and broader social, economic, and cultural circumstances—informs the comprehensive approach taken in this analysis of the postwar historiography of Germany's *Volkskunde*.

An important context element that LaCapra's assertion seems to gloss, but that is essential for the present analysis, is that of reception: the horizon of expectations in which historiography participates on the field shared between author and *readers*, including the audience's stakes in the narrative. Elsewhere, LaCapra seems to indicate toward the shifting context of reception when he claims "the past is not simply a finished

---

expectations," in that these all refer to a collection of shared references that enable subject positions to become visible in the field, as opposed to actors taking positions in the field. It is the stuff of communicative competence, as opposed to the communicating subject—the ground positions available for the subject to emerge, with both cognitive and affective dimensions.

[94] Dominick LaCapra, *Rethinking Intellectual History: Texts, Contexts, Language* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1983), 16, emphasis original. See also Dominick LaCapra and Steven Laurence Kaplan, eds., *Modern European Intellectual History: Reappraisals and New Perspectives* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1982).

story to be narrated but a process linked to each historian's own time of narration."[95] But Ulfried Geuter and Mitchell G. Ash give clearer shape to this notion for the historical sociology of science as both scholars insist on the need to consider sociocultural contexts in order to understand the role of disciplinary historiography at the time of writing and in the present, that is, its reception across time.[96] This diachronic element of disciplinary historiography proves to be especially salient for Germany's postwar *Volkskunde*, as earlier accounts of the field's history are continually revisited, reinterpreted, and redeployed to meet the horizon of expectations of contemporary audiences.

In consequence, the analysis pursued in the present project will consider the complex interplay of the various elements (agents, institutions, epistemologies, geopolitics, etc.) that inhabit the field of *Volkskunde* at key turning points in the history of the discipline and of the fields with which it intersects. As such, it must move beyond observations like White's to consider the fact that such narratives occupy the fields on which the discipline plays out its politics (identity and otherwise) by claiming its symbolic capital. The confluent issues of context and writer/reader positionality in all historiography thus point to an overarching question in the history of science that will be addressed in this study, as well: any analysis of statements *from within* the field of *Volkskunde* must be analyzed as strategic, such that one must read them against questions like, what is the purpose, or what are the stakes, of acts of writing disciplinary historiography for Germany's *Volkskunde*?

---

[95] LaCapra, *Rethinking Intellectual History*, 18.

[96] See Ash, "The Self-Presentation of a Discipline: History of Psychology in the United States Between Pedagogy and Scholarship"; Ulfried Geuter, "The Uses of History for the Shaping of a Field: Observations on German Psychology," in *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*, ed. Loren R. Graham, Wolf Lepenies, and Peter Weingart, Sociology of the Sciences 7 (Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1983), 191–228.

In one sense, the answer is simple: sociologists of science have summarized this in the one word, legitimation.[97] The writing and rewriting of a discipline's past by its practitioners often has a strategic or ideological function aimed generally at legitimating present theories and methods, and ultimately reasserting a field's status as independent and valuable. While such strategizing may be more or less conscious or deliberate, disciplinary historiography is in any case a matter of identity construction reflecting the interests of a scholarly community, both as representatives of their discipline and as members of other groups concerned with it, on other planes of imminence that intersect with them.[98] As such, these narratives of disciplinary history cannot be seen simply as a matter of recording a field's past; they also reflect its stakes in the present, and can have tangible effects on a discipline's structure and practice into the future as they legitimize narratives that define "normal science" for its present.

The need for such legitimation via historiography can be provoked by various developments, including new scientific discoveries (the traditional Kuhnian paradigm shift), internal debates about existing theory or methodology, the (perceived) encroachment of a neighboring field on a common research object or practice, the

---

[97] This is the conclusion arrived at across the case studies in the collection by Graham, Lepenies, and Weingart, *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*. And in fact, the volume editors Wolf Lepenies and Peter Weingart regard the legitimating function of the history of science as something common to all history writing: "Histories of science make no exception to history writing in general in serving the function of legitimation." Lepenies and Weingart, "Introduction," xv. One might further relate this insight to Bourdieu's theory of social practice as applied to fields of specialized knowledge: namely, one finds across these theories the implication that disciplinary historiography is ultimately a matter of authorized speakers making claims about symbolic and material capital. Moreover, Kuhn's model implies that some level of institutionalization is the fundamental condition of "normal science," and that this status is at least in part attained through historiographic reconstruction of programmatic statements and canonical studies recounting the achievements that define a field's boundaries. That is, Kuhnian history of science does nod toward the legitimating function of historiographic discourse, yet largely without problematizing it as part of a network of strategies that can perform this legitimizing function.

[98] The most obvious example of such an intersection for *Volkskunde* is the interface between the discipline's engagement with understanding groups of people and the Nazi-era's preoccupation with "purifying" national groups—interests which impact both sides, even without or prior to any overt collaboration.

infiltration of a potentially disruptive political philosophy (such as the rise of materialism, which affected disciplines across the scientific spectrum), or even direct state co-option for political purposes, as was unquestionably the leading provocation for the proliferation of historiography of Germany's *Volkskunde* after World War II. Still, as Wolf Lepenies, Peter Weingart, and other sociologists of the history of science have argued, one cannot simply reduce disciplinary historiography to its legitimating function or ideological implications, either.[99] Since by now the legitimating function of history of science is a truism,[100] and the need for *Volkskunde* to reassert its legitimacy after World War II is obvious,[101] this study attempts a more nuanced examination of the form and implications of disciplinary historiography by examining:

1) the narrative forms of the field's postwar historiography;
2) the various and shifting contexts of the history writing; and
3) the implications of the *Volkskunde*'s historiographical identity construction for the field's epistemic and organizational structure.

In order to understand how disciplinary historiography functions as a specific intervention of legitimization within a particular horizon of expectation, we must consider the implications of its narrative forms within the proximate and extended

---

[99] Lepenies and Weingart caution against assuming that historiography is progressive in its intent; disciplinary historiography can serve both conservative—that is, to prevent or counteract change—and progressive functions, which will be seen in the case of *Volkskunde*. Lepenies and Weingart, "Introduction," xvii.

[100] Rachel Lauden, "Redefinitions of a Discipline: Histories of Geology and Geological History," in *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*, ed. Wolf Lepenies, Peter Weingart, and Loren R. Graham, Sociology of the Sciences 7 (Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1983), 79.

[101] German *Volkskundler* Helge Gerndt points explicitly to the legitimating function of *Volkskunde*'s postwar historiography. In an attempt to rise above the ideological investments that have inhered in these narratives, he proposes to let key postwar texts simply speak for themselves, without contextualization. Gerndt, *Fach und Begriff "Volkskunde."* Lepenies's notion of legitimation in historiography of science is applied more explicitly to the case of *Volkskunde* by Vera Deissner, though her focus is on the historiography only up to 1931. Deißner, "Zur Geschichte volkskundlicher Fachgeschichtsschreibung bis 1931."

contexts in which they are intended to function, how those forms may have acquired or rejected traditional expectations about what they mean, and how their execution answers to the specific moment in which they were constructed and circulated—the specific symbolic power that they claim.

Concern with the narrative forms of *Volkskunde*'s historiography is found in a few precedents to this study.[102] One especially resonant example is Mary Beth Stein's 1987 article in the *Journal of Folklore Research*, which applies Hayden White's concept of "emplotment" to examine the dominant discursive frameworks applied in internal disciplinary historiography concerning Nazi-era *Volkskunde* in West Germany.[103] Stein argues that all of these framings fall within the broader, national historiographic conceptual framework of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, which she anchors in examples from the field of literature.[104] Part I of this dissertation, concerning *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, reflects Stein's periodization of *Volkskunde*'s historiography

---

[102] In addition to Mary Beth Stein's work, discussed in the section, see Sabine Eggmann's work on the discourse of "*Kultur*" in German *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* and Vera Deißner's study of *Volkskunde* historiography to 1931. Sabine Eggmann, *"Kultur"-Konstruktionen: Die gegenwärtige Gesellschaft im Spiegel volkskundlich-kulturwissenschaftlichen Wissens* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2009); Deißner, "Zur Geschichte volkskundlicher Fachgeschichtsschreibung bis 1931." Certain of my interviewees noted the salience of Stein's (American) and Eggmann's (Swiss) positioning outside the German field, positing that their relative cultural distance facilitates a certain level of ethnographic insight perhaps unavailable to the German *Volkskundler* themselves.

[103] Mary Beth Stein, "Coming to Terms with the Past: The Depiction of 'Volkskunde' in the Third Reich since 1945," *Journal of Folklore Research* 24, no. 2 (1987): 157–85. Although Stein's analysis of the emplotment of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in West German *Volkskunde*'s historiography operates via a comparison with the literary field, it also may be read as reflecting a dominant theme in West German public discourse at the time writing, namely the swell of debates among historians, philosophers, and journalists now referred to as the *Historikerstreit* (see Introduction to Part I of the present work).

[104] Stein's identification of West German *Volkskunde*'s historiography as a problem worth examining mirrors conclusions I came to independently while studying cultural anthropology in Germany and continuing to engage the field's historiography past that experience. That we both came to this interest in the history and historiography of *Volkskunde* is perhaps no coincidence, as Stein's intellectual biography closely mirrors my own: she is an American Germanist folklorist who studied *empirische Kulturwissenschaft* in Tübingen as a graduate student in the 1980s. I would like to thank Professor Stein for discussing with me in more detail her research on Germany's *Volkskunde*, and for offering encouragement and feedback on this dissertation project.

vis-à-vis the Nazi era up to the 1980s. The dissertation expands on her treatment temporally, substantively, and theoretically by extending the analysis beyond the historiographic discourses of early 1980s West German *Volkskunde*—the limit of Stein's scope—to cover narrative manifestations of *Vergangenheitbewältigung*, their confluences and dissonances, in histories of East and reunified German *Volkskunde* as well. This includes the differentiated framings of key figures (Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl and Adolf Spamer in particular) and postwar theoretical directions (such as the study of displaced Germans [*Vertriebene*]), between East and West, as well as new facets of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* that have emerged since the 1990s, including examination of the fate of Jewish *Volkskundler* and the ways in which *Volkskunde*, like broader German culture, defines and moves toward "normalcy."

The limits of a discipline-internal analysis like Stein's prove to be its strengths and its weakness alike as a project of critical historiography. Where Stein relies on an adaptation of White's notion of emplotment to account for the ways in which *Volkskundler* framed their discipline's response to its Nazi past, this study proposes to adapt a different element of White's model: the trope. Emplotment or plot, whether in literary or historiographic narrative, provides the "meaning" or explanation of a story by signaling what kind of story it is.[105] For White, there are only a limited number of basic emplotments of history, based on classical categories: tragedy, comedy, satire, romance, epic, etc. In her work, Stein casts off White's narrow typology and instead identifies three successive emplotments specific to the historiography of *Volkskunde*'s ideological involvements with the Third Reich.[106] In Stein's analysis, *Volkskunde*'s historiography

[105] White, *Metahistory*, 7. Elsewhere, White defines plot as the "structure of relationships by which events contained in the account are endowed with a meaning by being identified as part of an integrated whole." Hayden V. White, "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality," *Critical Inquiry* 7, no. 1 (1980): 13. Quoted in Stein, "Coming to Terms with the Past," 158.
[106] Stein, "Coming to Terms with the Past," 158–159; see also 181n5.

were stories of individuals (distinguishing Nazified *Volkskundler* from "legitimate" *Volkskundler* who were at worst merely following along [*Mitläufer*]); ideas (specifically the critique of Nazi co-opted concepts like *Volk*, formerly central to the discipline, but now deemed unusable), and academic institutions under Nazi political control.

Tropes, in contrast, require larger contexts of cultural practice and inheritance to understand, because they implicate such narrative emplotments in more specific historical fields.[107] That is, they turn the logical structures of narrative into site-specific logics of utterance, each with a different significance. For example, a "coming of age" story means one thing when told in the era of Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister* (late 1700s), as a group of educated middle-class Germans seek their place in society, and something far different in Joseph Goebbels's *Michael* (1929)—both have the historically specific trope of "finding one's community" as a central part of their emplotments, but "fitting in" has a different implication on the very different planes on which each text functions.

Drawing from classical hermeneutics, modern linguistics, and modern literary theory, White identifies four basic, ostensibly universal tropes: metaphor, metonymy, synechdoche, and irony. But where White's model focuses on tropes' literary and historiographic work in structuring textual utterances for cognition (distinguishing, for example, the difference between using part-to-whole logic or irony to situate a text's strategy for making meaning), the present study adopts an expanded, more culturally situated notion of tropes that emphasizes their role in structuring our understandings of human interaction and social practice in cultural context.[108]

---

[107] White, *Metahistory*, 31–38.

[108] The anthropological concern with tropes, or the metaphorical in culture, can be found across the foundations of the field, from Frazer to Boas, Lévi-Strauss to Turner. For a brief history of this analytical tradition, see James W. Fernandez's introduction to James W. Fernandez, ed., *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology* (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 1991). See also Dominic Boyer, *Spirit and System: Media, Intellectuals, and the Dialectic in Modern German Culture* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005), 35–39.

Anthropologist Paul Friedrich, for instance, defines tropes as "the great and little prepatterns that variously channel, influence, and determine how the speaker interrelates elements of language to each other and interrelates language itself and the rest of the world."[109] In the study of culture (and in this study of *Volkskunde* understood as a social field or subculture overlapping and intersecting with other fields), that is, tropes are less a matter of specific figures of speech that reflect certain logics, and more a matter of the cultural underpinnings—social and cognitive—that structure and facilitate communication and interaction. Thus "fitting in" as a trope works structurally-cognitively as a synechdoche, identifying (in the example of a *Bildungsroman*) any one act of joining into society as signaling joining into that society wholeheartedly. However, that act of joining means something quite different in the field of social action before 1830 than it does after 1930, when issues of force and threat come to the fore, rather than simply social coherence and values. For postwar German *Volkskunde*, *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, as will be explored in Part I, becomes such a trope: borrowed from dominant society and its concern with the Nazi past, but used with different implications.

I am not alone in highlighting the fact that reading tropes has two faces, one logical and one more site-specific. Dominic Boyer offers a more recent example of anthropological trope analysis in his 2005 ethnography, *Spirit and System*, in which he follows the circulation and transformation of terms like *Geist*, *Kultur*, and *System*, and the historical-philosophical notion of the dialectic more broadly, as tropes of discourse among former East German intellectuals. Moving beyond purely rhetorical or cognitive approaches that clarify the structure and use of such tropes, Boyer employs a more

[109] Paul Friedrich, "Polytropy," in *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, ed. James W. Fernandez (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 1991), 54–55. Quoted in Boyer, *Spirit and System*, 38.

nuanced phenomenological rendition of trope analysis that considers the power of tropes to orient not only communication between individual agents—that is, "intersubjective processes of meaning formation"[110]—but also broader social practice as a consequence of these communicative practices.[111] This so-called "play of tropes" is understood as inherently instable and open ended, as the intersubjective meaning of tropes morphs across time and social fields—across fields in Bourdieu's sense, as I have explained them earlier. Just as importantly, Boyer cautions against attributing agency to tropes themselves.[112] Instead, this approach focuses on the individuals and communities of social actors who create, employ, reproduce, and "variously construe the intentions and significance of"[113] tropes in creating meaning for their own acts, identities, and lives.

Understanding tropes in this sense, my project considers *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* and its surrounding semantic field to be just one of several historiographic tropes that structure and facilitate communication and interaction among *Volkskundler* and between them and other fields or subcultures in the postwar era, and in turn have implications for the organizational and epistemological structuring of the discipline itself. To further highlight the intersubjective "play" of historiographic tropes on the field of *Volkskunde* and the emplotments for historical self-legitmizing narratives, I propose to layer in another category of cultural analysis closely related to anthropology's trope theory: performance. Emerging at the nexus of performing arts, linguistics, sociology, and anthropology, today's interdisciplinary performance studies

---

[110] Boyer, *Spirit and System*, 38.

[111] Tropes, Boyer asserts, are "an ideal means for apprehending the juncture between subjective experience and intersubjective exchange in terms of conceptual, referential, and indexical processes of analogy, contiguity, formality, modality, and so on." Ibid.

[112] Concerning cautions against the analytical reification of tropes, Boyer refers to Andreas Glaeser, *Divided in Unity: Identity, Germany, and the Berlin Police* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000); Fernandez, *Beyond Metaphor*.

[113] Boyer, *Spirit and System*, 38.

examines how humans interactively craft their individual and collective cultural identities—how they act to accrue symbolic or cultural capital to bolster their own positions within the group.[114] Performances are, in the words of folklorist Deborah Kapchan, "aesthetic practices—patterns of behavior, ways of speaking, manners of bodily comportment—whose repetitions situate actors in time and space, structuring individual and group identities."[115] This notion of performance has an advantage over White's simpler casting of historiography as "verbal fictions, . . . as much *invented* as *found*"[116] in that it shifts attention from the constructedness of historical narratives themselves to the positionality, stakes, and interactions of the social actors who perform, witness, interpret, promulgate, and transform such historiographic discourse within the context of instable and intersecting social fields—in short, how individuals understand and create meanings for their own identities out of the available discourses. The current project, then, can best be described as examining the *narrative performance* of several central tropes of the postwar historiography of *Volkskunde* and the implications of these uses of patterns of emplotment and tropes for the ongoing restructuring of the discipline's discursive legitimation and identity.[117] This dissertation, then, examines the *narrative*

---

[114] Foundational texts for interdisciplinary performance studies include Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1959); J.L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962); John J. Gumperz and Dell H. Hymes, *Directions in Sociolinguistics; the Ethnography of Communication.* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972); Victor W. Turner, *The Anthropology of Performance*, Performance Studies Series 4 (New York: PAJ Publications, 1988); Richard Schechner and Victor W. Turner, *Between Theater & Anthropology* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985); José E. Limón and M.J. Young, "Frontiers, Settlements and Development in Folklore Studies, 1972–1985," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15 (1986): 437–60. For an overview of performance studies, see for instance Frank J. Korom, *The Anthropology of Performance: A Reader*, Wiley Blackwell Anthologies in Social and Cultural Anthropology 30 (Hoboken: Wiley, 2013).

[115] Deborah A. Kapchan, "Performance," *The Journal of American Folklore* 108, no. 430 (1995): 479.

[116] White, *Tropics of Discourse*, 82, emphasis original.

[117] Bernhard Giesen's study of German intellectuals picks up on a similar notion which he discusses in terms of "communication rituals" that reproduce the collective identity of that social group and grant legitimacy to those who participate competently in such communicative performances. Bernhard Giesen, *Intellectuals and the German Nation: Collective Identity in an Axial Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge

performance of several central tropes of the postwar historiography of *Volkskunde* and the implications of these patterns of discourse for the ongoing structuring of the discipline.

INSTITUTIONAL MEMORY AND TRANSLATION

To this point in the chapter, I have discussed how this study builds upon two classic modes of historiography of scientific fields—the paradigmatic and the epistemic—and adds to this two additional modes of analysis—the tropic and the performative, drawn from critical historiography and cultural anthropology—to support a broader understanding of disciplines as social fields. Thus far, the emphasis of my argument has been on 1) the perspectival nature of history-writing and 2) the legitimating function of historiographic discourse for scientific fields. This section considers how two interdisciplinary fields—memory studies and translation studies—can provide additional insight into how precisely historiography informs the way scientific fields are structured by addressing the relationship among lived history, memory, and history-writing.

The applicability of memory studies to the present project is most obvious in Parts I and II, which engage the tropes of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* and German national division, respectively—two now standard topics in contemporary memory studies research.[118] However, my analysis does not revolve around the common binary of

---

University Press, 1998), 45. Boyer sees Giesen's approach as an alternative to Bourdieu's theory of social practice, which Boyer characterizes as overly functionalist. Boyer, *Spirit and System*, 31. In the sense that Bourdieu's field theory tends to emphasize the dynamics of systems of power over the agency, compentency, and intersubjectivity of actors, I am compelled to agree with Boyer's evaluation. However, I view the notion of performance not as an alternative, but rather a supplement to Bourdieu's model.

[118] From the 1980s until today, memory studies research, especially within the sphere of German Studies, most frequently is conducted with reference to national identity or collective trauma regarding World War II, the Holocaust, and subsequent national division and reunification. See, for instance, Andreas Huyssen, *Present Pasts: Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2003); Mieke Bal, Jonathan V. Crewe, and Leo Spitzer, eds., *Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the*

memory and trauma, identified by some *Volkskunde* historiographers as a dynamic in the discipline.[119] Rather, as my analysis of the trope of boundaries in Part III will support, I argue more broadly that notions of collective memory and their connection to history and historiography are applicable with regard to larger questions of how any field of culture, including a scientific discipline, remembers and recounts itself.

The field of memory studies covers a broad range of perspectives, from the individual, cognitive functioning of the recall of events or experiences, to the cultural or social foundations of collective memory, to public memorialization practices. This study relies at the most basic level on the notion of collective memory credited to the philosopher and sociologist Maurice Halbwachs in the 1950s.[120] The fundamental insight offered by Halbwachs concerning collective memory is that "the past is a social construction mainly, if not wholly, shaped by the concerns of the present."[121]

Present (Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 1999); Aleida Assmann and Ute Frevert, *Geschichtsvergessenheit—Geschichtsversessenheit: Vom Umgang mit deutschen Vergangenheiten nach 1945* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1999); Alon Confino, *Germany as a Culture of Remembrance: Promises and Limits of Writing History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006); Alon Confino and Peter Fritzsche, eds., *The Work of Memory: New Directions in the Study of German Society and Culture* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002). For a new perspective on how memory studies might be further applied in broader scholarship on German/European twentieth century history, especially for the case of former Communist Eastern Europe, see Larson Powell, "The Meaning of Working through the East," *German Studies Review* 37, no. 3 (2014): 597–614.

[119] For example, Bendix, "From 'Volkskunde' to the 'Field of Many Names,'" 371.

[120] Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, Heritage of Sociology (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992). Maurice Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory, with an Introduction by Mary Douglas* (New York: Harper-Colophon Books, 1950).

[121] Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 25. Or, as Halbwachs-interpreter Jan Assmann observed about the oral and written historiography of the ancient world, "Vergangenheit entsteht überhaupt erst dadurch, daß man sich auf sie bezieht." ("The past only first emerges when one refers to it.") Jan Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*, Beck'sche Reihe (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2000), 30. This understanding of the relationship between memory and history for the field of *Volkskunde* has been observed with regard to historiographic treatments of the Third Reich. See, for instance, Udo Mischek, "Fachgeschichte aus ethnologischer Perspektive," in *Probleme und Perspektiven der volkskundlich-kulturwissenschaftlichen Fachgeschichtsschreibung. Versammelt die überarbeiteten Vorträge eines Arbeitstreffens, das am 26. und 27. November 2004 in Dresden unter dem Titel "Perspektiven und Probleme der ethnologischen Fachgeschichtsschreibung" veranstaltet hat*, ed. Petr Lozoviuk and Johannes Moser (Dresden: Thelem, 2005), 73–74.

Furthermore, the identity of a group, defined as any number of individuals sharing a social institution delimited spatially and temporally,[122] both circumscribes and is further supported by[123] its collective memory of the past.[124] In this sense, it is not individuals who remember the group's past directly, but rather the social institutions (such as scientific disciplines) that store, stimulate, select, interpret, and circumscribe the memory of their individual members.

Regarding the relationship between collective memory and historiography, historian Jacque Le Goff, like other scholars of critical historiography discussed thus far, sees a manipulative function to all historiography. Casting historiography as a written form of collective memory, Le Goff maintains that "collective memory is not only a conquest, it is also an instrument and an objective of power." While Le Goff has an overt political agenda in pointing out the power wielded in the manipulation of collective memory through history writing, his fundamental observation about the dialectic of memory and history—that "memory, on which history draws and which it nourishes in return, seeks to save the past in order to serve the present and the future"[125]—rings true for any project of legitimation, including that of scientific disciplines. Indeed, sociologists concerned with critical historiography echo Le Goff in recognizing that, "[like] any historiography, the history of scientific disciplines has an ideological function."[126]

---

[122] Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory*, 84. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 25.

[123] The symbiotic relationship between collective memory and group identity is akin to Bourdieu's notion of social reproduction, that is, the stabilization of social and cultural structures, praxis and *habitus* over time. See, for instance, Bourdieu and Passeron, *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*.

[124] It should be noted, however, that Halbwachs does not fall into the tautology of cultural memory and cultural identity; rather, there are as many collective memories as there are groups and institutions in society. While individuals remember, their groups or institution provides context for remembering/recreating the past. Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory*, 48.

[125] Jacques Le Goff, *History and Memory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), 97 and 99.

[126] Lepenies and Weingart, "Introduction," x.

While memory theory is not frequently cited in the context of history of science research, the language of memory (and forgetting) is a crucial thought model in the critical historiography of the sciences.[127] The explicit invocation of memory studies does appear in research on disciplinary or institutional historiography that involves ethnographic methods, however. For instance, in Teresa Brinkel's recently published history of East German *Volkskunde*, composed in part using ethnographic methods, notions of collective memory serve to posit the selectivity of collective memory as a means of group identification or group identity construction, and to suggest that the oral history interviews with individual *Volkskundler* may be read as reflecting the collective memory of the field.[128] Connecting the abstract language of memory studies with the analytical pursuits of the history, philosophy, and sociology of science in this way retrains our sight onto the articulators of collective memory (the history-writers), the other stakeholders who stand to benefit (or not) from the conveyance of certain memories of the past, and the various repositories of collective memory, from published historiography to the inscription of lived history in the organizing structures of the present.[129] Of particular interest for the present project is the dynamics of collective

---

[127] Lepenies and Weingart observe, for instance: "On the one hand, the traditional history of science was told as a story of hero and hero worship, on the other hand it was, paradoxically enough, the constant attempt to remind the scientist whom he should better forget." Ibid., ix.

[128] Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*, 14–15. Specifically, Brinkel refers to the foundational work of Maurice Halbwachs and cites Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis*. The connection between life history narration and collective memory is also noted by ethnographer Charlotte Linde, who observes: "an individual's life story is not the property of that individual alone, but also belongs to others who have shared the events narrative—or were placed to have opinions about them." Charlotte Linde, *Working the Past: Narrative and Institutional Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 4. Interestingly, in contrast to Brinkel, Linde believe that individual oral history interviews are not an appropriate source for studying collective memory. Ibid., 5. Assuming a space between the two positions, I would posit that the features of collective memory are present in both authorized, published historiography and personal memory narratives: both narrative modes reflect the selective memory of the group (even in cases where that memory is being contested), and so serve to create or support group identity.

[129] In other words, it is a matter of the interaction between discourse (Luhmann's "semantics") and structures of social field(s). For a similar interpretation of Luhmann's "semantics" as forming a complimentary relationship with social structure, see Urs Stäheli, "Die Nachträglichkeit der Semantik: Zum

memory in the space between narrative performances of *Volkskunde*'s past and its disciplinary structures across new historical contexts of these discourses' production and reception.

The concept of collective memory has been variously nuanced from the perspectives of history, anthropology, discourse analysis, and interdisciplinary cultural studies (Holocaust Studies, postcolonial studies, area studies, etc.), yielding such terms as cultural memory,[130] institutional memory, public memory, and organizational memory.[131] In the field of anthropology, for instance, Mary Douglas builds upon Halbwachs's work to describe how social institutions like scientific disciplines sustain, and are sustained by, collective remembering and collective forgetting (what she calls "structural amnesia").[132] This notion that institutions both remember *and* forget[133] speaks to the larger argument of this dissertation, that the historiography of *Volkskunde*—understood as a particular kind of receptacle of collective memory—reflects the stakes of legitimating the present state of the discipline in the face of ideological ruptures that threaten to or successfully

---

Verhältnis von Sozialstruktur und Semantik," *Soziale Systeme* 4, no. 2 (1998): 315–40, cited in Powell, "The Meaning of Working through the East," 601.

130 Theodor Adorno is credited with coining "cultural memory " in the essay "Was bedeutet: Aufarbeitung der Vergangenheit?," in *Gesammelte Schriften: Kulturkritik und Gesellschaft*, Vol. 10.2 (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1977), 555–72. For more recent, formal explications of this concept, see especially Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis*. See also Jan Assmann and Tonio Hölscher, eds., *Kultur und Gedächtnis* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1988); Aleida Assmann, *Erinnerungsräume: Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*, 3. Aufl., C.H. Beck Kulturwissenschaft (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2006). A systematic critique of the Assmann's concept of "cultural memory" and alternative models, in particular Niklas Luhmann's notion of "cultural semantics," is presented in Powell, "The Meaning of Working through the East."

131 On the concept of organizational memory as used in the field of management studies, see, for instance, James P. Walsh and Gerardo Rivera Ungson, "Organizational Memory," *Academy of Management Review* 21, no. 1 (1991): 57–91

132 Mary Douglas, *How Institutions Think* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1986), 70. See also Ibid., especially chapters 6 and 7. It is also worth noting that Douglas and Halbwachs share a close intellectual heritage, via the sociology of Emil Durkheim, of whom Halbwachs himself was a student. Douglas' work was strongly influenced by both. In fact, she provided the Introduction to the original 1950 edition of Halbwachs' *On Collective Memory*.

133 On the role of history in forgetting, see also Paul Ricœur, *Memory, History, Forgetting* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2004).

deligitmate the field. To this end, I employ the notion of institutional memory as defined by cultural anthropologist Charlotte Linde in her research on historical narrative within a large American insurance company.

Before defining institutional memory, it is necessary to define the term institution. The definition that Linde proposes "includes both formal and informal groupings of people and established and recognizable practices."[134] Linde distinguishes institutions from organizations, defining the latter as a subtype of institution that includes formal and legal structures. From this perspective, *Volkskunde* as a field of knowledge production is an institution, but not an organization; a university department of *Volkskunde*, in contrast, is both an organization and an institution (as are the professional organizations that support these departments). Anthropologist Michael Agar proposes a more critical notion of institution, which he posits as inextricably linked to power: an institution is "a socially legitimated expertise together with those persons authorized to implement it."[135] For this study, I refer to the field of *Volkskunde* as an institution and to the specific organizational or bureaucratic bodies as structures (in Bourdieu's sense) that comprise the field as part of the practices, *habitus*, possible subject positions, and individual actors belonging to a specialist knowledge community.

Like the theorists of critical historiography (including critical sociology of the history of science) discussed in the previous section, Linde sees in an institution's narratives of its history a "working," that is, a strategic framing, emplotment, or indeed

---

[134] Linde, *Working the Past: Narrative and Institutional Memory*, 7.

[135] Michael Agar, "Institutional Discourse," *Text* 5, no. 3 (1985): 164. Critical notions of institution, and its linkage to power and discourse, are derived from the social theory of seminal figures like Max Weber, Jürgen Habermas, Antonio Gramsci, Michel Foucault, and Pierre Bourdieu. For additional background further examples of research in the critical analysis of institutional discourse, see Andrea Mayr, *Language and Power: An Introduction to Institutional Discourse* (New York: Continuum, 2008); Fairclough, *Language and Power*; Norman Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change* (Cambridge: Polity, 1992); Fairclough and Wodak, "Critical Discourse Analysis."

manipulation of the past. But Linde goes further in uncovering the social and narrative workings of institutional memory. She emphasizes, for instance, the pressure to coherence across narrators within an institution. Echoing the interpretive logic of both Kuhnian history of science and White's critical historiography, Linde discerns a typology of narrative frames along which institutional memory is organized: stories of origin, stories of rupture, and stories of achievement. Certainly such issues of power and narrative type will be discussed within the scope of the present analysis. But for the case study of Germany's *Volkskunde*, the concept of institutional memory takes on an additional meaning with respect to the relationship between disciplinary historiography and disciplinary structures.

My analysis will show that *Volkskunde* historiography is not simply a receptacle of the field's past that supports, and is supported by, group identity at a particular point in time. Rather, these narratives influence the structures of the field. Stated another way, discursive performances of institutional identity—that is, the production of narrative that is the stuff of institutional memory—are actually imprinted in the discipline's structures: its theories and methods, university institutes and other knowledge-generating and disseminating bodies, and the relations with other fields, especially between *Volkskunde* and its neighboring disciplines, but also between the science and the state.[136] Linde's and Agar's definitions both lack attention to this aspect of institutions: the fact that not just

[136] With this notion of *Volkskunde*'s institutional memory being inscribed in the field's structures through narratives, I do not intend to imply a connection with Pierre Nora's *lieux de mémoire* (sites of memory), by which is meant designated spaces of memorialization. However, further elements of Nora's ruminations on the relationship between memory and history are relevant for this analysis. Nora argues that memory and history, in the past understood as synonymous, are today posited as fundamentally opposed: Memory is living, history is stabilized. Memory is both multiple and specific, and constantly evolving through the present. History is an incomplete reconstruction of things past; it claim universal authority, yet it is positional (and so inviting critical analysis). Pierre Nora, *Rethinking France (Les Lieux de Mémoire)* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2001); Pierre Nora, "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire," *Representations* 26 (1989): 7–24. More pointedly, Nora claims that "history is perpetually suspicious of memory, and its true mission is to suppress and destroy it." Ibid., 9.

their membership, but their other structures as well are held together and in fact formed by institutional memory and the stories that transmit those memories.

To describe this symbiotic relationship between *Volkskunde*'s historiography and its institutional structures as they evolve across generations of scholars confronting new institutional and ideological pressures in conversation with other social fields, one might further think in terms of "postmemory." But where Marianne Hirsch, coiner of the term, is concerned with how *private* biography and national or public history are intertwined in the memory of World War II,[137] I propose the concept of "institutional postmemory" for the case of German *Volkskunde* to illuminate the implications of the generational distance between the intellectual rupture of World War II, the starting point for my case study, and the discipline's succeeding self-refashionings.

This extension of the idea of institutional memory does not rely solely on memory theory, which is largely centered around the rememberers and sites of memory, but also on translation studies, which focuses on texts. The current generation of translation studies, formed at the nexus of literary hermeneutics[138] and anthropological theory,[139]

---

[137] Marianne Hirsch, *Family Frames: Photography, Narrative, and Postmemory* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997), 13. Hirsch developed the notion of postmemory in relation to children of Holocaust survivors, but, she believes, "it may usefully describe other second-generation memories of cultural or collective traumatic events and experiences." Ibid., 22. See also Marianne Hirsch, *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012). Hirsch's notion may be compared with Alison Landsberg's concept of prosthetic memory, defined as "privately felt public memories that develop after an encounter with a mass cultural representation of the past, when new images and ideas come into contact with a person's own archive of experience." Alison Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory the Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 19. Moreover, she states, "a person does not simply apprehend a historical narrative but takes on a more personal, deeply felt memory of the past event through which he or she did not live." Ibid., 4. While Landsberg is speaking specifically with reference to the memory effects of personal encounters with mass cultural representations of the past (in film, museums, etc.), the insight that new perspectives (and with that, rewritings) emerge via contact between historical representation and personal experience (informed by one's position in the social field) resonates with the argument of this study.

[138] In particular the reception theory of Hans Robert Jauss and Wolfgang Iser, as well as the literary hermeneutics of Peter Szondi. See Jauss, "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory"; Iser, *The*

posits translation as an intervention between discourses, most often between two cultures, but also between memory and historical representation.[140] Not only is translation useful for this project on a conceptual level, it also offers an alternative to the often negative, pathologizing language of critical historiography. The framework of translation allows the analysis to maintain a view to ideology without overemphasizing or reducing historiography to solely a matter of politics and strategies. Instead of speaking about history-writing as manipulations or fictions, I prefer the language of critical translation theorists like André Lefevere and Theo Hermans,[141] who use the term "rewriting" to

---

Implied Reader; Peter Szondi, *Einführung in die literarische Hermeneutik* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1975).

[139] Since the groundbreaking work of Clifford Geertz, translation or interpretation has become central metaphor for the work of cultural anthropology. See Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (New York: Basic Books, 1973). This metaphor acknowledges the interpretive work or framing of ethnographic narrative in terms of the source-target relationship between the "home" culture of the writer (and possibly, though not necessarily, the reader) and the "other" culture to be translated. Moreover, this view also emphasizes the interpretive nature of ethnography, eschewing any notion that it is a matter of objective and complete recounting of facts. Extending this vein of thought, much has been made in recent decades of the "space between" cultures, or "third space," in which meaning is ambivalent and negotiated. See, for instance, Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994), 35–39. Understandably, then, the notion of cultural translation resonates well with critical historiography—in fact Dominic LaCapra's direct reference to Clifford Geertz's *The Interpretation of Cultures* suggests a conversation between two fields both concerned with narrating the other—another culture, another time. LaCapra, *Rethinking Intellectual History*, 16.

[140] See, for instance, Sanford Budick and Wolfgang Iser, eds., *The Translatability of Cultures: Figurations of the Space between* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1996), especially Gabriel Motzkin's chapter on memory and cultural translation, 263–281; Anuradha Dingwaney Needham and Carol Maier, *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross-Cultural Texts* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1995).

[141] André Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, Translation Studies (London: Routledge, 1992); Theo Hermans, *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985). See also Maria Tymoczko and Edwin Gentzler, *Translation and Power* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002). With relation to Tymoczko and Gentzler's volume, for example, a view to the power dynamics of translation becomes especially salient for the discussion of how certain communities of actors come to dominate the historiographic narrative, such as *Volkskunde*'s "68er" critics's translation of the disciplinary identity narrative into the broader public narrative trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*.

Both Lefevere and Hermans use the term "manipulation" to speak about how rewriting (be it translation, historiography, editing, etc.) works to mobilize texts in the service of ideology. While the role of ideology—especially in terms of the legitimating function of historiography—is an important aspect of the present analysis, I opt rather for their sense of translation as rewriting in order to emphasize the positionality and contexts of historiography's production and reception as the more fundamental elements for analysis. And in fact, this same language is used within the critical historiography of science. Rachel

stress the politics of moving the "same" text into a different cultural context. In speaking of the "rewriting" or "translation" of *Volkskunde*'s history, I refer to how the field's members reassert and reenact prior intradisciplinary events and critiques, in good faith and to convenient political ends for both individual *Volkskundler* and the discipline as a whole.[142]

For the case of *Volkskunde*, I am interested in the translation of the narrative tropes of institutional memory in three senses:

1) *Translation across succeeding historical contexts*. Echoing the basic tenets of critical historiography and collective memory research, each generation of *Volkskundler* frames the field's past in a way that serves the discipline in the present. This plane of interpretation is therefore especially concerned with the positionality and performance of the historiographer as translator.[143] The concept of "institutional postmemory" helps to further illuminate this phenomenon by speaking to how each succeeding generation remembers and recounts disciplinary history—translating each prior translation from a new perspective and to new ends—from ever more distant historical and cultural points of view.

2) *Translation between Volkskunde and other fields*, including both scientific fields and the field of public discourse concerning German history and postwar identity.

Lauden, in her chapter on histories of geology in the same volume, speaks in terms of "rewriting" history, for instance. Lauden, "Redefinitions of a Discipline: Histories of Geology and Geological History," 99. The ultimate point of this terminological intervention is to emphasize, as Lepenies and colleagues have done, that one cannot reduce critical historiography to the hunt for legitimating ideology alone. Rather, greater attention to the issues of sociocultural context, author positionality, audience reception(s), and structural implications is required.

142 On a more basic level, one might think of the work of translation in terms of the dual meaning of the German term *übersetzen*, which can mean "to translate (a language)" or "to transport (something from one site to another)," depending on stress placement.

143 Compare Lawrence Venuti's work on the ethics of translation, Lawrence Venuti, *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology* (London: Routledge, 1992); Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (London: Routledge, 1995); Lawrence Venuti, *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference* (London: Routledge, 1998).

Recalling LaCapra's insistence that we problematize the context of historiography's production and receptions, considering the case of *Volkskunde* in terms of translation suggests this is not a pursuit of some overarching historical consciousness or historical truth that is veiled by political pursuits (i.e., the quest for legitimation), but rather to demonstrate how historiographic discourse about a field forms in conversation with other fields of discourse. Narrative tropes are especially salient with regard to this level of translation, in that they are the transforming and transformative discursive pathways that connect fields. While translation theory is typically framed in terms of source and target, I adopt this metaphor not to emphasize or reify boundaries between past and present, or between *Volkskunde* and other fields, but rather to draw attention to the multivalence and dynamics of institutional memory as manifested in historiographic narratives, and with that, the need to pay attention to the contexts of historical representation and its reception.

3) *Translation between historiographic narrative and the field's organizational and epistemic structures.* At this level I am concerned with institutional memory in a second sense, namely, that an institution's past is not simply recounted in historiographic narratives; these collective memories of *Volkskunde*—many of them "translations" of earlier published historiography—become imprinted in the field's structures. In this sense, then, the analysis in Part I will substantiate Mary Beth Stein's tentative conclusion that "the discussions of the National Socialist period of *Volkskunde* have created a rupture in the discipline characterized by divergent goals of justification, critique, and revision."[144] That is, not only *Volkskunde*'s actual entanglements with National Socialism, but the succeeding internal discussions of that history, its ties to prewar

[144] Stein, "Coming to Terms with the Past," 180–181.

Volkskunde, and its resonances in the postwar context inflected by new national and international geopolitical alignments had a destabilizing effect on the field.

Part I specifies what the rupture to which Stein refers consists in: the structural fracturing of *Volkskunde* into several epistemological orientations and politically inflected camps. But this is only one example of the structural implications of *Volkskunde*'s institutional memory to be treated in this study. In the course of Parts I, II, and III, I will demonstrate how institutional memory, recounted in disciplinary historiography and inflected by ever new confluences and fissures with other fields, yielded such further structural repercussions as the postwar emphasis of methodology over theory, efforts to maintain (or remove) boundaries with closely neighboring scientific fields, and, in a case of institutional forgetting, the postreunification effacing of former East German *Volkskunde*'s ideas, institutions, and community of scholars.

In these ways, this study mobilizes translation theory to reveal disciplinary historiography as a multidimensional problem characterized by a synergistic dynamism involving permutations of stable and discontinuous institutional and political cultures, and institutional postmemory to refer to the rewritings and the work of historical understanding they performs for the practitioners of a discipline. Together, these layers of analysis help to answer another key question in the critical historiography of science: What effect, if any, does historiography have on a discipline itself. That is, can a retelling of a field's history affect its theories, methods, institutional forms, etc., going forward?[145] Research in the sociology of other scientific fields, including the natural sciences, social sciences, and the humanities, presents numerous examples demonstrating how disciplinary history-writing does indeed impact the field itself. For instance, Reinhart

[145] See, for instance, the case studies in Graham, Lepenies, and Weingart, *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*.

Herzog explicates the interdependence between histories of classical philology and paradigm shifts within the field, as well as future plans for the discipline. That is, the discipline's "self-image" or "self-reassurance" that is manifested in historiography has a programmatic "steering function" for future research embedded within both institutional history and research politics.[146] The present project will go a step further to show how institutional memory—the rewriting of "translation" of *Volkskunde*'s history, and the inscription of this narrative in disciplinary structures—is furthermore embedded in larger national and international political and cultural contexts.

[146] Reinhart Herzog, "On the Relation of Disciplinary Development and Historical Self-Presentation: The Case of Classical Philology since the End of the Eighteenth Century," in *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*, ed. Loren R. Graham, Wolf Lepenies, and Peter Weingart, Sociology of the Sciences 7 (Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1983), 281–282. See also in the same volume Ash, "The Self-Presentation of a Discipline: History of Psychology in the United States Between Pedagogy and Scholarship."

PART I:

TRANSLATIONS OF *VERGANGENHEITSBEWÄLTIGUNG* IN THE INSTITUTIONAL MEMORY OF WEST GERMAN *VOLKSKUNDE*

The most readily identifiable trope of West German postwar *Volkskunde*, that of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* (overcoming the Nazi past), will be the subject of Part I. To map the key role this trope plays in the symbiosis of historiographic narrative and structural transformation that is *Volkskunde*'s institutional memory, the three chapters of Part I will trace three elements of the discipline's postwar historiography: 1) how historical figures and events in *Volkskunde*'s history before 1945 are narratively deployed to respond to the effects of having participated in the National Socialist project; 2) how those narratives work to translate intradisciplinary concerns across broader historical turning points in West German politics and society vis-à-vis the Nazi past, especially by exploiting narrative tropes held in common with different fields of Germany's public discourse; and 3) the structural implications—both institutional and epistemic—of the narrative performances of disciplinary identity.

To situate this analysis of disciplinary discourse, I present first a brief overview of the origins of the concept of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* and its various manifestations

and elaborations in West German public discourse since the end of World War II.[147] The term, typically translated into English as overcoming or coming to terms with the past, is best understood not as a particular coinage, but as an evolving, summarizing signifier of the manifold postwar debates and discourses concerning National Socialism. Indeed, the term is itself among the items subjected to debate, as it is broken down into various narrative elements by diverse interest groups.

The term's usage can be traced to Occupier-initiated denazification and reeducation programs, church initiatives for social reform, and diagnostic declarations by politicians, philosophers, sociologists, authors, and psychologists in the Federal Republic concerning the nature, depth, and implications of Nazism's taint in all elements of German identity. In one of the most memorable public invocations of the term, Frankfurt School sociologist Theodor Adorno articulated the crux of the problem that *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* encapsulates, asking, what does it mean to work through (*bearbeiten*) Germany's Nazi past?[148] The semantic space between Adorno's "working through" and the more persistent formulation of "overcoming" throws into relief the poles of action glossed in using the term, namely, the distinction between a society-wide wish or attempt to overcome the past via avoidance, forgetting, or a strategic historiographic emplotment, and the active, arduous, and ongoing process of facing, exploring, and finding an ethical response to the National Socialist past and its

---

[147] For a useful overview of the discursive field of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, its key articulators and manifestations, see Torben Fischer and Matthias N. Lorenz, eds., *Lexikon der "Vergangenheitsbewältigung" in Deutschland: Debatten- und Diskursgeschichte des Nationalsozialismus nach 1945* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2007). See also Dan Mikhman, *Remembering the Holocaust in Germany, 1945–2000: German Strategies and Jewish Responses* (New York: P. Lang, 2002); Christa Hoffmann, *Stunden Null?: Vergangenheitsbewältigung in Deutschland 1945 und 1989* (Bonn: Bouvier, 1992); Peter Reichel, *Vergangenheitsbewältigung in Deutschland: Die Auseinandersetzung mit der NS-Diktatur von 1945 bis heute* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2001); Jeffrey Herf, *Divided Memory: The Nazi Past in the Two Germanys* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997).

[148] Adorno, "Was bedeutet: Aufarbeitung der Vergangenheit?"

reverberations in the institutions and history of contemporary Germany. In other words, where *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* indexes overcoming by setting aside, Adorno's formulation indexes overcoming by working through the problems of guilt, culpability, and expiation associated with experiences of Germany's Nazi era.

Once coined and integrated into public discourse, the trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* underwent numerous critical shifts that added further dimensions to its meaning and to its power to structure memories of German history and national identity. Among the ancillary notions that became implicated in connection *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* are:

- Germany's "zero hour" (*Stunde Null*) in 1945 and the concomitant framing of ordinary Germans as victims who could finally restart their lives;
- questions of collective guilt[149] and reparations (*Wiedergutmachung*), but also collective trauma[150];
- the continuing specter of fascism in public life (*unbewältigte Vergangenheit* / unconquered past) that was a focal point of the 1968 revolution and 1970s left-radical domestic terrorism[151];
- the place of National Socialism and the Holocaust in German and world history, an issue raised in the immediate postwar period as the *Sonderweg* (special path) debate among German historians[152]; and

---

[149] See especially Karl Jaspers, *Die Schuldfrage: Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Frage* (Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1946); Max Picard, *Hitler in uns selbst* (Erlenbach-Zürich: E. Rentsch, 1946).

[150] Alexander Mitscherlich and Margarete Mitscherlich, *Die Unfähigkeit zu trauern: Grundlagen kollektiven Verhaltens* (Munich: Piper, 1967).

[151] See especially the essay "Hitler in euch" (1961) in Ulrike Marie Meinhof, *Deutschland, Deutschland unter anderm: Aufsätze und Polemiken* (Berlin: Wagenbach, 1995).

[152] *Sonderweg* refers to a perspective in German historiography that suggests that the formation of the German nation-state followed a path diverging significantly from other European countries—a unique path that yielded a particular set of social, political, and even psychological structures that ultimately facilitated the rise of National Socialism. Although originally bearing a positive connection in its coinage around the German imperial period, during World War II and immediately thereafter it became a negative term that

- the distinctions between West German and East German experiences and narratives of Nazi totalitarianism, in particular its purported extension into East German Communism (*doppelte Vergangenheitsbewältigung*).[153]

Today, with the passing of the war generation, we may not recognize the nuances of these debates, as the concern in German public discourse has shifted from dealing with the insidious implications of the past for the present to constructing a public memory culture whereby museums, memorial sites, and rituals,[154] but also mass media representations[155] can offer newer, albeit never quite satisfactory solutions to the question of how to most appropriately remember the full breadth of atrocities surrounding the Nazi regime. Between 1945 and 1960, the German population was dealing with its active memories, experiences, and possible guilt; today, we must regard *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* as a concept invented to structure memory and public discourses within the postwar context.

---

demarcated opposing historiographic camps regarding how German history ought to be explained and remembered. In the immediate postwar period, the debate over the *Sonderweg* was associated especially with Friedrich Meinecke, who argued for the *Sonderweg* interpretation, and Gerhard Ritter, who opposed that perspective. The *Sonderweg* debate reemerged with the *Historikerstreit* in the late 1980s. See, for instance, Friedrich Meinecke, *Die deutsche Katastrophe, Betrachtungen und Erinnerungen* (Wiesbaden: E. Brockhaus, 1946); James Knowlton and Truett Cates, trans., *Forever in the Shadow of Hitler?: Original Documents of the Historikerstreit, the Controversy Concerning the Singularity of the Holocaust* (Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities, 1993); Alfred D. Low, *The Third Reich and the Holocaust in German Historiography: Toward the Historikerstreit of the Mid-1980s* (New York: East European Monographs, 1994).

153 See, for instance, Herf, *Divided Memory*, 1997; Anne Fuchs, Mary Cosgrove, and Georg Grote, eds., *German Memory Contests: The Quest for Identity in Literature, Film, and Discourse Since 1990*, Studies in German Literature, Linguistics, and Culture (Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2006). *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in the context of East German history and competing East-West German memories of the Nazi past will be covered in greater detail in Part II.

154 Prominent among these are the controversial *Wehrmacht* museum exhibition of the late 1990s and the erection of the "Denkmal für die ermordeten Juden Europas" memorial and museum, opened in 2005.

155 These include critical reconsiderations of the television broadcast of the Eichmann trial in 1962, the 1978 *Holocaust* television miniseries, and myriad filmic revisions of World War II history, from early postwar *Trümmerfilm* to 1970s/80s New German Cinema to more recent international films like *Europa Europa* (1991), *Schindler's List* (1996), *La vita é bella* (1997), *The Reader* (2008, based on Bernhard Schlink's 1995 novel *Der Vorleser*), and *Die Fälscher* (2008).

The academic study of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* indeed began in this way, emerging as a special topic in interdisciplinary German Studies beginning in the early 1990s.[156] In mapping the phenomenon, that research has identified traces of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* within the discursive fields of literature,[157] mass media,[158] intellectual debate,[159] and public memorialization,[160] each with its own function and narrative shape.

---

[156] Worth mentioning here is a novel study that resonates with the tropological project pursued in this dissertation: Rachel J. Halverson's comparison of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* discourses in the fields of historiography and German postwar literature. Rachel J. Halverson, *Historiography and Fiction: Siegfried Lenz and the "Historikerstreit,"* German Life and Civilization 8 (New York: P. Lang, 1990).

[157] Among the anchor points of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* discourse in the field of literature are West German *Trümmerliteratur* and the self-styled antifascist author collective *Gruppe 47* (as well as succeeding generations' criticisms thereof, W.G. Sebald's in particular); Martin Walser's 1998 award reception speech which suggested Germans move on from the past, lest its memorialization become empty ritual; and Günter Grass's 2006 autobiographical admission of participating in the Hitlerjugend. Works of so-called Holocaust literature by such authors as Ruth Klüger, herself a survivor, as well as popular, controversial nonfiction works, notably Daniel Goldhagen's 1996 *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, are also reference points in scholarly discussions of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in literature. See W.G. Sebald, *Luftkrieg und Literatur: Mit einem Essay zu Alfred Andersch* (Munich: Hanser, 1999); Martin Walser, *Ansprachen aus Anlaß der Verleihung des Friedenspreises des Deutschen Buchhandels an Martin Walser in der Paulskirche zu Frankfurt am Main* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag der Buchhändler-Vereinigung, 1998); Günter Grass, *Beim Häuten der Zwiebel*, 1. Aufl (Göttingen: Steidl, 2006); Ruth Klüger, *Weiter Leben. Eine Jugend* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 1992); Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* (New York: Knopf, 1996).

[158] See, for instance, Wulf Kansteiner, *In Pursuit of German Memory: History, Television, and Politics after Auschwitz*, 1st ed. (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2006); Helmut Schmitz, ed., *A Nation of Victims?: Representations of German Wartime Suffering from 1945 to the Present*, German Monitor 67 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007); Robert R. Shandley, *Rubble Films: German Cinema in the Shadow of the Third Reich* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Temple University Press, 2001); Paul Cooke and Marc Silberman, eds., *Screening War: Perspectives on German Suffering* (Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2010); Anton Kaes, *Deutschlandbilder: Die Wiederkehr der Geschichte als Film* (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 1987).

[159] Most prominently, the late-1980s *Historikerstreit*. See Low, *The Third Reich and the Holocaust in German Historiography*. See also footnotes 152 and 306 in the present work.

[160] See, for instance, Karen E. Till, *The New Berlin: Memory, Politics, Place* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005); Assmann, *Erinnerungsräume*; Silke Arnold-de Simine, *Mediating Memory in the Museum: Trauma, Empathy, Nostalgia*, Palgrave Macmillan Memory Studies (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); James Edward Young, *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1993); Huyssen, *Present Pasts*; Justyna Beinek and Piotr H. Kosicki, eds., *Re-Mapping Polish-German Historical Memory: Physical, Political, and Literary Spaces since World War II* (Bloomington, Ind.: Slavica, 2011); Mitchell B. Merback, *Pilgrimage & Pogrom: Violence, Memory, and Visual Culture at the Host-Miracle Shrines of Germany and Austria* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2012).

As discussed in the Introduction to the present project, scholarly disciplines themselves also engaged reflexively in, or were made the subject of, critical historiographic analyses of Nazi-era science, which include reference to the more general period project of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*. The analysis presented in Part I will reveal parallels and divergences between the trajectory of debates about the Federal Republic's fraught path in public discourse, and how the *Volkskunde* community there dealt narratively with the field's Nazi entanglements—that is, how the historiography of *Volkskunde* employs tropes associated with *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* as a means of understanding its own current identity and past culpability.

Across the social fields constituting postwar West German culture, one can trace an arc of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* from avoidance, to revolution, to attempted normalization. This analysis will reveal how *Volkskunde*'s discursive performances follow a congruent trajectory: historiographical dealings with the Nazi past would be translated from an immediate mission of resuscitation amid a crisis of legitimacy to a methodological and ethical commonplace and even a point of national disciplinary pride.

Following a pattern found across West German society, German *Volkskundler* found themselves in the immediate aftermath of World War II in a holding pattern, unsure of how their discipline, deeply implicated in Nazi racial and cultural ideology, could move forward. Part I examines a series of prominent articulations of disciplinary history across the four major turning points vis-à-vis *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* that have become prominent reference points for the discipline's postwar periodization.[161] That this periodization is also common to German social historiography supports the

[161] This periodization of *Volkskunde*'s postwar history can be found, for instance, in Gerndt, *Fach und Begriff "Volkskunde"*; Stein, "Coming to Terms with the Past"; James R. Dow and Hannjost Lixfeld, eds., *The Nazification of an Academic Discipline: Folklore in the Third Reich* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993); Kaschuba, *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*; Georget, "Welche Zukunftsaussichten hat die Volkskunde? Eine Wissenschaft zwischen deutscher Nostalgie und europäischer Offnung."

broadest argument of this dissertation: that scientific fields develop in conversation with other social fields. However, as this analysis will show, the periodization itself—that is, the interpretation and representation of *Volkskunde*'s history, and German postwar history overall—is not a matter of pure observation and objective recounting. It is infused with interpretation, a characteristic of historiography that Hayden White describes as a matter of literary emplotment, a "fiction." However, as this dissertation intends to demonstrate, the evolution of historiography may be better understood in more neutral, indeed anthropological, terms of performance, memory, and translation.

The first turning point in the standard periodization, which is the topic of the first chapter of Part I, is the immediate postwar situation, characterized by a period of *status quo* or stagnation, as some would have it, and lasting from the end of the war in Europe to the early 1960s. During this time, critical considerations of the field's Nazi involvements were initiated from outside the field and largely resisted from within.

West Germany's "1968" is identified as the second major turning point in *Volkskunde*'s disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*. The translations of the field's history that took place around this time, in step with a broader trend of social upheaval, will be the topic of Chapter 2. Carried out through rigorous, frequently contentious stock-taking (*Bestandsaufnahme*) and debates about possible future directions for the field, this turn is associated most strongly with the programmatic writings of *Volkskundler* at the University of Tübingen and with a fateful meeting of *Volkskunde* professors and students at Falkenstein near Frankfurt am Main. These and other discursive sites of antagonism would see the formation of "conservative" and "progressive" factions whose formation reflected the major political fault lines within West German society and an associated, international Cold War consciousness. The ideological / methodological splitting of

Volkskunde around the 1960s/70s would have major effects for the field's structuring that are still reflected in its present form—indelibly imprinted in institutional memory.

Chapter 3, the final chapter of Part I, will begin by considering a new direction in the engagement with *Volkskunde*'s Nazi past that started in the early 1980s—a "third wave" of disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, so to speak. Inspired in part by the twenty-year anniversary of "1968," and lasting into the mid-1990s, this requickening of interest in disciplinary history reveals more clearly the ideological fault lines of a field whose post-Falkenstein structural fracturing was solidifying into a permanent division within what supposed to be a single, independent discipline. This turn, as it will be demonstrated, also occurred in step with broader West / reunified German debates about how Germany's role in the Holocaust ought to be remembered and what significance *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* should hold for German identity going forward in a unified Europe.

The third chapter also considers a fourth trend beginning in the 1990s, namely, the field's approaching a state of normalcy, which this study considers, again, in terms of the interaction of social fields: reunified Germany's normalization as part of the international ecumene, and German *Volkskunde*'s approaching a state akin to Thomas Kuhn's "normal science." As a consequence, the historiography of this period appears to mark the beginning of historical reflexivity as a real disciplinary commonplace, similar to a concurrent movement in Anglophone anthropology, but couched in the particular fraughtness of German history.

Part I concludes by tracing an emerging pattern of disciplinary postmemory, whereby a new generation of scholars—both German and non-German—revisits previous—and establishes new—translations of a discipline doubly burdened—on the one hand by the reality of the field's National Socialist entanglements, and on the other

hand by subsequent ideological battles rooted in that past and inflected by movements in German society, world geopolitics, and the international anthropological community. With the general patterns of *Volkskunde*'s historiographic translations now in view, we turn to the primary texts to examine the key historiographic strategies and turns, articulators and audiences, and the implications of these narrative performances for the formation of *Volkskunde*'s institutional memory.

Chapter 1:

First Responses, 1945–1960

As was the case across scientific disciplines in Germany, study and research at institutes of *Volkskunde* became subject to oversight by the Allied Forces that would occupy the country from its unconditional capitulation on May 7, 1945 until the establishment of the two German states in 1949. The de-Nazification process, which involved the suspension or removal of staff, censorship of publications,[162] and reorganization or complete closing of institutes, did not, however, bring the field to a complete standstill. Doctoral students of *Volkskunde* continued to complete dissertations through the late 1940s,[163] and several *Volkskunde* chairs were reinstated as early as 1946.

The patterns of *Volkskunde*'s de-Nazification can be viewed clearly in the fates of individual faculty members, all of whom had to suspend work for a time before it was determined whether or not they could resume a professorship. Main theoreticians (Hans

[162] For instance, the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*, which was suspended in 1941, did not resume publication until 1953. Established in 1891 as the publishing organ of the Berlin Verein für Volkskunde, the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* was and continues to be the main national journal for the field. The editors of the first postwar issue explained that, even as *Volkskunde* was successfully rebuilding its international reputation, financial constraints associated with postwar rebuilding prevented the *Zeitschrift* from resuming its work of sharing *Volkskunde*'s scientific contributions nationally or internationally until 1953.

[163] Lutz Röhrich, *Bibliographie volkskundlicher Dissertationen an deutschen Universitäten 1945–1950* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Landesstelle für Volkskunde, 1951).

Naumann at the University of Bonn, most prominently) and institute chairs (for instance Gustav Bebermeyer[164] at the NSDAP-established *Volkskunde* institute at the University of Tübingen), who were party members or whose research and leadership were tightly bound with the regime, lost their professorships.

Not all Nazified *Volkskunde* professors were completely exiled from the field or from academia, however. Bebermeyer, for instance, though he lost his professorship, resumed teaching there from 1955 to his death in 1975. Examples of Nazi *Volkskundler* who did not hold professorships during the Third Reich, but assumed leadership positions in the field after the war also abound. Wilhelm Brepohl, for instance, was an active Nazi and worked directly for the party propaganda machine. He did not hold a professorship before or during the war, but afterward took up an academic position in sociology in Dortmund, and later Münster. Likewise, Herbert Freudenthal, who was judged "belastet"[165] in the de-Nazification process, continued a career as a famous *Volkskundler*, publishing books and articles, though he had to take a lower teaching post at the University of Hamburg. Thus mirroring a broader trend in German society and politics, Nazified *Volkskundler* were frequently allowed to resume leadership in their field soon after war's end.

Still other *Volkskundler* were allowed to return to leadership positions in the discipline even though they had received overt support from the Third Reich. These were

---

[164] Among other Nazi party members or sympathizers named by Wolfgang Emmerich in his exposé of *Volkskunde*'s ideological entanglements with the Nazi regime are *Volkskundler* Max Hildebert Boehm, Eugen Fehrle, Adolf Helbok, August Lämmle, Edmund Mudrak, Harry Schewe, Karl von Spieß, Walther Steller, and Matthes Ziegler. Emmerich, *Zur Kritik der Volkstumsideologie*, 117–118.

[165] In the context of Germany's de-Nazification, "belastet" was among the official categories used to describe an individual's level of complicity in the Nazi regime. The five main categories were: *Hauptschuldig* (exonerated), *Mitläufer* (follower), *Minderbelastete* (lesser offender), *Belastete* (offender), and *Hauptschuldig* (major offender). Each category of offense was assigned a particular grade of punishment or sanction. See Control Council Directive No. 38, *Occupation and the Emergence of Two States, 1945–1961 (October 12, 1946)*, German History in Documents and Images, Vol. 8, accessed March 15, 2015, http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/pdf/eng/Denazification%202%20ENG.pdf.

typically individuals who contributed strongly to the discipline, but who did not share the state ideology (or whose stance remains ambiguous or unknown). A well-known example of such "inner emigrants"[166] of German *Volkskunde* is Adolf Spamer, who was installed in 1936 as chair of the first independent institute of *Volkskunde* at the Friedrich-Wilhelms University (now Humboldt University) of Berlin and after the war was tasked with reestablishing *Volkskunde* in the Soviet Occupied Zone (Sowjetische Besatzungszone, SBZ).[167]

Finally, university *Volkskundler* known to have opposed Nazism throughout their careers, as evidenced by their persecution by the regime, were permitted to resume, or to assume new leadership of the profession most immediately after the war. A prime example of this was Will-Erich Peuckert, the first professor of *Volkskunde* to be reinstated (in Göttingen), whose notable first articulation of the field's postwar situation will be discussed shortly.

The representation of Nazi-era *Volkskunde* and *Volkskundler* in the first two decades after war's end would follow many now recognized conventions of trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, from conspicuous silence and pregnant euphemism, to confluent discourses of victimization and the parsing of levels of complicity and guilt (including the precarious status of "inner emigration"), to an obsession with looking for a way forward while avoiding the details of wartime activity. The victim narrative

---

166 On the so-called "Exil-Debatte" surrounding Thomas Mann's criticism of "innere Emigration" of German authors in particular, see Reinhold Grimm et al., eds., *Exil und innere Emigration*, Wisconsin Workshop. Internationale Tagung in St. Louis (Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1972); Jost Hermand, *Kultur in finsteren Zeiten: Nazifaschismus, Innere Emigration, Exil* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2010); Jost Hermand and Wigand Lange, *Wollt ihr Thomas Mann wiederhaben?: Deutschland und die Emigranten* (Hamburg: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1999).

167 Two additional examples of supposed "inner emigrant" *Volkskundler* are Wilhelm Peßler, who was allowed to continue his work on the *Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde* through the war into the late 1950s, and John Meier, who was director of the Verband deutscher Vereine für Volkskunde continuously through the war years until 1948, and remained a prominent figure in the field until his death in 1953.

manifests in the distancing language of "victims of circumstance"[168] and in multilevel indexing of individual / discipline / all sciences / German civil society.[169] That is, attributions of complicity or guilt would be dispersed among the levels of individual, institution, and discipline, glossing with neat categorizations the complicated interweavings of lived reality. Conveniently resurrected for this narrative were *Volkskunde*'s not-so-distant origins as a loose consortium of regional dilettante collectors whose residual national and ethnic pride did not infect the "real" scientific *Volkskundler*, who instead followed the tradition of the initially marginal, now proudly touted founder, Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl.[170]

Indeed, the placement of Riehl as the central figure in *Volkskunde*'s founding myth is a prime example of the mobilization of history for the purpose of legitimating a scientific field—or, in this case, relegitimating a field that, at the end of World War II, was considered completely illegitimate.[171] In the disciplinary historiography of the early

---

[168] See, for instance, Gerhard Lutz, *Volkskunde: Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte ihrer Probleme, mit einem Geleitwort von Josef Dünninger* (Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1958), 229.

[169] See, for instance, Will-Erich Peuckert, "Zur Situation der Volkskunde," *Die Nachbarn: Jahrbuch für vergelichende Volkskunde* 1 (1948): 133.

[170] On the ambiguity of Riehl's meaning for *Volkskunde*, see, for instance, Wilhelm Brepohl, "Die Geschichtlichkeit des Volkstums und der Gegenstand der Volkskunde," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 52 (1955): 4; Hans Moser, "Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl und die Volkskunde: Eine wissenschaftliche Korrektur," *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 1 (1978): 9–66; Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, *Deutsche Volkskunde zwischen Germanistik und Sozialwissenschaften*, Sammlung Metzler 79 (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1969); Lutz, *Volkskunde: Ein Handbuch*; Wolfgang Jacobeit, *Bäuerliche Arbeit und Wirtschaft: Ein Beitrag zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der deutschen Volkskunde* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1965); Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, *Einführung in die Volkskunde, Europäische Ethnologie: Eine Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, 2. erweiterte und ergänzte Auflage, Sammlung Metzler 79 (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1985), 42–54; Wolfgang Jacobeit, "Auseinandersetzung mit der NS-Zeit in der DDR-Volkskunde," in *Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus: Referate und Diskussionen einer Tagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, München, 23. bis 25. Oktober 1986*, ed. Helge Gerndt (Munich: Münchner Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1989), 301–18. See also the entry for "Volkskunde" in Oswald Adolf Erich and Richard Beitl, *Wörterbuch der deutschen Volkskunde* (Stuttgart: A. Kröner, 1955), 799–809.

[171] On the role of founding myths in the history of science, see, for example, Bernadette Bensaude-Vincent, "A Founder Myth in the History of Sciences?—The Lavoisier Case," in *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*, ed. Loren R. Graham, Wolf Lepenies, and Peter Weingart, Sociology of the Sciences 7 (Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1983), 53–78.

postwar years, Riehl's concern with the mission (*Aufgabe*) and application (*Anwendung*) of *Volkskunde* would be translated from its Weimar- and Nazi-era national-ideological iterations[172] into the future-oriented, outward-looking discourse of the West German *Wirtschaftswunder* (economic miracle).[173] The invocation and succeeding translations of the notion of *Volkskunde*'s *Aufgabe* vis-à-vis the public and the state evidences what by now is a truism in studies of the history and sociology of science. That is, in the words of Wolf Lepenies and Peter Weingart: "The legitimation of science with arguments of utility or of its cultural value has as long a tradition as the development of modern science itself."[174]

But while *Volkskundler* writing in the late 1940s and early 50s positioned Riehl as evidence that the field, at its core, was not irrevocably tainted, those years are characterized in succeeding historiography as a period of stagnation and attempts to continue, or get back to, business as usual.[175] That is, *Volkskunde*'s initial public response to de-Nazification is remembered in the history books as effectively no response, or at

---

[172] See, for instance Hans Naumann, *Deutsche Volkskunde* (Gotha: Perthes, 1921), 6; Julius Schwietering, "Wesen und Aufgaben der deutschen Volkskunde," *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 5 (1927): 748–65; Eugen Fehrle, "Die Staatsführung ist die angewandte Heimatkunde," *Mein Heimatland* 22 (1935): 61–65.

[173] Lutz, *Volkskunde: Ein Handbuch*, 232; John Meier, "Der Verband deutscher Vereine für Volkskunde: Sein Werden und Wirken 1904–1954," in *50 Jahre Verband der Vereine für Volkskunde 1904–1954* (Stuttgart: Verband der Vereine für Volkskunde, 1954), 27. Besides those contributions discussed here, other, lesser remembered early statements on the "Aufgabe" of *Volkskunde* include Martin Wähler, "Volkskunde als Grundwissenschaft: Die Aufgabe der sozialen Volkskunde," *Niederdeutsches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 22 (1947): 111–45; Karl Meisen, "Europäische Volkskunde als Forschungsaufgabe," *Reinisches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 3 (1952): 7ff. Examples of this discourse within East German *Volkskunde* will be discussed in Part II. On the history and historiographic discourses of the *Wirtschaftswunder* in West Germany, see especially Hanna Schissler, ed., *The Miracle Years: A Cultural History of West Germany, 1949–1968* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

[174] Lepenies and Weingart, "Introduction," xvi.

[175] As Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann describes it in the first edition of her enduring history of the field, instead of pursuing a rigorous self-critique, *Volkskunde* after the war "verharrte . . . , unangepaßt in alten Denkkategorien." Weber-Kellermann, *Deutsche Volkskunde zwischen Germanistik und Sozialwissenschaften*, 85. Compare Anne Claire Groffmann et al., eds., *Kulturanthropologinnen im Dialog: ein Buch für und mit Ina-Maria Greverus* (Königstein/Taunus: U. Helmer, 1997), 7; Kaschuba, *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*, 78–83.

least not a proactive one. In fact, the first public response to *Volkskunde*'s Nazi entanglements came not from within the field, but from a sociologist, putting *Volkskundler* in a double-defensive position.

In 1946, Marburg sociologist Heinz Maus published an article entitled "Zur Situation der deutschen Volkskunde" in the journal *Die Umschau: International Revue*,[176] an Ally-sponsored postwar periodical that Maus himself helped to edit from 1946–1948. The situation of *Volkskunde* at the end of World War II was indeed dire, Maus argues, but the root of the field's downfall was not in its political co-option in support of Nazi racist-imperialist motives, but rather in the very foundations of the discipline itself. Namely, its origins in romanticizing, historical, yet dehistoricizing cultural theory oriented toward an eternal notion of the *Volk* led easily to the field's assumption into a unique ideological dialectic, as Maus refers to it, with Nazism.

To support this claim, Maus discusses the initial politicizing influence of Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl, who in the mid-1800s envisioned *Volkskunde* as an independent discipline oriented toward the critical study of modern, industrial society. Rather than counteracting the sentimental, fetishizing construction of the *Volk*, Maus argues, Riehl's noble, yet ultimately unpopular ideal of making *Volkskunde* a useful science became twisted, thus exacerbating the problem. These twin impulses of romanticism and public-*cum*-state service led to *Volkskunde*'s institutions easy conversion into "propaganda factories" (*Propagandafabriken*) supplying a language of German fascist superiority and imperial right with the pseudomythological term *Volk*, its various compounds (*Volkstum*, *Volksgeist*, *Volksseele*, *Volkscharakter*, etc.), and associated concepts (*Blut und Boden*,

[176] Licensed by the French Occupied Zone and run mainly by Germans who had opposed the Nazi regime from within—whether in so-called "inner exile" or imprisonment—the stated goal of the journal was to bring Germany back from alienation from the world and fight "German egocentrism" through positive means. Adam Johannes Haller, "Zum Geleit," *Die Umschau: Internationale Revue* 1, no. 1 (September 1946): 6–10.

Oberschicht / *Unterschicht*, etc.).[177] Despite this heavy criticism, however, Maus does not assign conscious guilt to the *Volkskundler*, but rather describes their role in terms of "*Ideologiehaftigkeit*" (ideological nature), "*Mißbrauch*" (misuse), "*Blindheit*" (blindness), "*vertrauend*" (trusting), "*karger privater Protest*" (sparse private protest)—their greatest sins being opportunism and silence in the face of co-option and ultimately in the service of mass murder.[178]

With the war now over, Maus proposes a multitiered resolution to *Volkskunde*'s political and moral corruption. First and foremost, a shift in theory and methodology is required whereby the unreflected collection of cultural products and use of current terminology must cease. To achieve this shift, he argues, the field ought to align itself and cooperate with its supposedly less tarnished neighbors *Ethnologie*, *Soziologie*, and *Sozialgeschichte*. While this proposal might seem to lead to the dissolution of *Volkskunde* as an independent field, Maus suggests that it could in fact contribute to a useful social-scientific study of modern society by offering a bottom-up, historicizing description, not in terms of cultural strata (Hans Naumann's "*Schichten*"), but more in alignment with Marx's notion of the working class in capitalist society.

Still, Maus continues, *Volkskunde*'s purpose in historicizing culture cannot be restoration, but rather the improvement of social and interculural relations in the present. In other words, though the field was corruptible from the beginning and its fortunes rose (and fell) with Nazism, Maus sees something redeemable in its fundamental work of *Kulturgeschichte*. In the course of this argument, one hears resonances of several formulations of early intellectual *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, from Frankfurt School

---

[177] Heinz Maus, "Zur Situation der deutschen Volkskunde," *Die Umschau: Internationale Revue* 1, no. 3 (1946): 349–351.
[178] Ibid., 355.

neo-Marxian social criticism,[179] to linguistic analyses of the functioning of Nazi ideology,[180] the distinguishing of types or levels of collective guilt,[181] and questions of particularity and the historical grounding of the rise and effectiveness of Nazism.[182]

But while members of some fields of the humanities and social sciences were prepared to engage in such national self-criticism in the immediate aftermath of the Nazi period, the *Volkskundler* were not. Within the *Volkskunde* community, Maus's thesis was received with resistance and rebukes, and goaded self-designated spokespersons for the field to work to redeem *Volkskunde*'s image with a historiographic narrative that emphasized its antimony, not its resonance, with Nazism. An early example of this is John Meier's 1947 history of the Verband deutscher Vereine für Volkskunde (which would become the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde). In that work, Meier casts *Volkskunde*'s relation to national politics as a by and large successful struggle for scientific independence and against political affiliations.[183]

Meier's writing was not a direct response to Maus, however. Instead, the first, and in fact only, direct rebuttal to the sociologist's harsh critique was penned by Will-Erich Peuckert at the University of Göttingen. Writing in the first issue of the journal *Nachbarn. Jahrbuch für vergleichende Volkskunde*, of which he was founding editor,

---

[179] Maus twice quotes Max Horkheimer to support his critique of fascism and prescription for a reformed *Volkskunde*. Maus, "Zur Situation der deutschen Volkskunde," 355, 359.

[180] Compare Victor Klemperer, *LTI: Notizbuch eines Philologen* (Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag, 1949); Geraldine Horan, *Mothers, Warriors, Guardians of the Soul: Female Discourse in National Socialism, 1924–1934*, Studia Linguistica Germanica 68 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003).

[181] Compare Jaspers, *Die Schuldfrage: Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Frage*.

[182] Compare Meinecke, *Die deutsche Katastrophe, Betrachtungen und Erinnerungen*.

[183] John Meier, *Der Verband deutscher Vereine für Volkskunde: Sein Werden und Wirken 1904–1944* (Lahr: Schauenburg, 1947), 26–27. Indeed, Meier contends that *Volkskunde*, as represented by its main professional organization at least, was left completely untainted by Nazi ideology: "Die führenden Kreise der Partei haben . . . den Verband seine Arbeiten ungestört und ungehemmt fortsetzen lassen, und er ist auch wohl die einzige größere Organisation gewesen, die an Haupt und Gliedern unangetastet gelassen ist und weder persönlich noch sachlich gleichgeschaltet wurde. Nur die kleinen Mitläufer und Nutznießer der Bewegung haben immer von neuem uns und unser Tun in der Öffentlichkeit verleumdet und mit Schmutz beworfen." Ibid., 27.

Peuckert echoes Meier's concluding assertion that *Volkskunde* as a discipline emerged unscathed and should continue with clear conscience its study and support, more important than ever, of the now trammeled German *Volkstum*. With the poles of debate thus clearly demarcated, the Maus-Peuckert debate would be inscribed in institutional memory as the first major discursive turning point in the field's process of postwar *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*.[184]

Peuckert accuses Maus, and Maus's journal *Die Umschau* in general, of arguing from a false premise and diverting attention away from more salient issues. He methodically dismantles Maus's argument about the state of *Volkskunde* vis-à-vis Nazism, first by reinterpreting quotations that Maus cites to demonstrate the fascist resonances of *Volkskunde* theory in a more neutralizing, even exonerating context. Peuckert then argues that the quotations Maus chose are not even representative of *Volkskunde* as a whole because they came from individuals whom Peuckert disassociates from the field as either extremists (e.g., Karl von Spieß) or Nazified dilettantes (e.g., Max Hildebert Boehm). As counterexamples who supposedly represent "real" *Volkskundler*—that is, researchers who critically reflect on their own field and on the political situation, including some who were persecuted by the Nazi regime—he lists John Meier, Friedrich Ranke, Fritz Böhm, and himself. Thus Peuckert distinguishes Nazified *Volkskundler* as

[184] References to Maus's article and to Will-Erich Peuckert's response to it can be found across *Volkskunde*'s historiography. Among the many sources that recapitulate the debate as a key moment in the field's postwar rebuilding are Hans Moser, "Gedanken zur heutigen Volkskunde: Ihre Situation, ihre Problematik, ihre Aufgaben," *Bayerisches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde*, 1954, 208–209; James R. Dow and Hannjost Lixfeld, eds., *German Volkskunde: A Decade of Theoretical Confrontation, Debate, and Reorientation (1967–1977)* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 11–12; Stein, "Coming to Terms with the Past"; Kaschuba, *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*, 78–79; Gerndt, *Fach und Begriff "Volkskunde,"* 25–54.

nonrepresentative of the discipline—a strategy Mary Beth Stein identifies as the first emplotment of postwar *Volkskunde*'s *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*.[185]

Peuckert furthermore accuses Maus of misunderstanding the full history of the field, and proceeds to describe what he sees as the actual nature and progress of the methodology and theory of *Volkskunde*, including the place of Riehl and Naumann in the development of a historically situated, yet presentist study of the working class and a more critically reflected meaning of *Volk* (for which Peuckert also largely credits himself). *Volkskundler*, Peuckert argues, were not merely romantic collectors unwittingly or opportunistically providing fodder for Nazi fascism as Maus suggests. That *Volkskunde* became inextricably linked to the Third Reich was not the fault of that scientific community, but of individuals cooperating with the regime *and* of the regime itself in its selection of certain cultural theories to co-opt for its own purposes. Reiterating Meier's position, Peuckert asserts: "It is not *Volkskunde* that is guilty, at least not Germany's scientific *Volkskunde*, but rather a political system that killed all sciences."[186] Peuckert counters Maus's evaluation of self-interested silence in Nazi-era *Volkskunde* with examples from Peuckert's own life and scholarly writings during that time. Thus he

---

[185] Stein, "Coming to Terms with the Past," 159–160. Stein's article covers well the major sources of discourse for the first (ca. 1945-1960), second (ca. 1960–1975), and third waves (ca. 1975–1985) of *Volkskunde*'s postwar historiographic enunciations—from phrases and allusions, to full monographs. The present study reaches beyond the scope and framing of Stein's work in four ways: 1) Rather than focusing on the depictions of Nazi-era *Volkskunde* in the field's historiography, this project considers also how the discipline's postwar historiography affected discipline's identity and organization—an element to which Stein only alludes (181). 2) The present study examines how the trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* is deployed in historiography beyond 1985, where Stein's chronology leaves off. 3) Stein examines *Vergangenheitsbewaltigung* discourse in West Germany only, whereas this study considers the phenomenon in East Germany in Part II. 4) This study considers *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* to be only one trope of *Volkskunde*'s historiography, with boundary-maintenance and -rupture as another—in fact overarching, as I will argue—trope in the field's postwar institutional memory that is becoming visible only as *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* discourse is finally translated into an ethic of ethnographic reflexivity in the twenty-first century.

[186] "Nicht die Volkskunde hat die Schuld, zumindest nicht die wissenschaftliche Volkskunde Deutschlands, sondern ein politisches System, das alle Wissenschaften tötete." Peuckert, "Zur Situation der Volkskunde," 133.

reaffirms that the *Volkskunde* research that was not approved or commandeered by the regime, even though it was not the public image of the field, was in fact representative of the field at that time.

In sum, Peuckert argues that Maus was too unfamiliar with *Volkskunde*, too focused on the field's public face in National Socialism, and too one-sided in his judgment to present a valid argument.[187] Here, historiography—including accusations of selective or insufficient historiographic representation—is deployed to distinguish kinds and levels of guilt, not in order to reform *Volkskunde* from the outside, nor even to reform it from within, but to maintain that no reform was needed.[188] Moreover, in making a case for recognizing the critical, ideologically resistant strains of *Volkskunde* as an untainted continuity, ready to reassume prominence after a period of political suppression, Peuckert's argument resonates with the "*Exildebatte*" (exile debate) over "inner emigration" in the literary field, whereby the question who was a real Nazi is converted to the question of who is not a real resister.

But Peuckert's resistance to Maus's proposals reflects a broader geopolitical tension, as well. Having studied under Frankfurt School representatives Karl Mannheim and Max Horkheimer, but also under Nazi-sympathizer Hans Freyer (of the Leipzig School), and having experienced both foreign exile and political-professional accommodation during the war years, Maus's ideological credentials covered an ambiguous spectrum from Marxist social critic to "inner immigrant" to Nazi *Mitläufer*

---

[187] Ibid., 131–132.

[188] As Peuckert explicitly states, "Es braucht dafür gar keine Wandlung ihres Namens; es braucht auch keine von außen an sie herangetragenen methodischen Lehren,—sie braucht auf dem von ihr im letzten Jahrzehnt eingeschlagenen Weg nur fortsetzen." ("There is no need for a change of name, nor for the introduction of an outside methodological approach—it [the field] needs only to continue on the path it has tread for a century.") Ibid., 134.

(followers-along). The dubious positionality of the critic thus becomes the final point in Peuckert's debunking mission.

After deflecting any accusation of *Mitläufer* hypocrisy away from himself throughout the article, Peuckert concludes by framing Maus's prescription for *Volkskunde* to become a socially useful, applied science ("*angewandte Wissenschaft*") as both an echo of Nazi fascism—making Maus the hypocrite—and of communist totalitarianism, thus positing Maus and his cohorts as the party in true need of reflection and ideological reform.[189] Reflecting a broader rhetorical trend in postwar social debates,[190] this tendency to set Nazism and communism on an equal plane would prove a useful deflection device for the generation of West German *Volkskunde* professors who lived through the war, and, according to more recent historiography concerning the progress of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* within the field, would continue into the early 1970s to serve those *Volkskundler* advocating a more traditional or "conservative" approach to *Volkskunde* (to be discussed in Chapter 2).

Peuckert's defense of the fundamental concepts and methods of *Volkskunde* would be echoed in the cultural theorizing of other leading *Volkskundler* into the late

---

[189] Ibid., 135. It should be noted that Peuckert was himself a socialist, thus his accusation is specifically implicating Maus as harboring Soviet Communist leanings. See Weber-Kellermann, *Deutsche Volkskunde zwischen Germanistik und Sozialwissenschaften*, 79. The extent of Peuckert's own socialist leanings are a matter of debate. For instance, Brigitte Bönisch-Brednich insists that "Peuckert . . . was no socialist, never a national socialist . . . . He was . . . an . . . individualist and therefore not willing to submit to the ruling opinion." Brigitte Bönisch-Brednich, *Volkskundliche Forschung in Schlesien: Eine Wissenschaftsgeschichte* (Marburg: Elwert, 1994), 216. Yet, as Johanna Jacobsen has demonstrated in her detailed study of Peuckert's life and work, his actual political leanings and the perceptions thereof within the field are not necessarily unified, thus his place in the spectrum of socialist ideology is not entirely clear. Johanna Micaela Jacobsen, "Boundary Breaking and Compliance: Will-Erich Peuckert and 20th Century German Volkskunde" (PhD Diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2007), 44, ProQuest (AAI3271772).

[190] See, for instance, Manfred Kittel, "Peripetie der Vergangenheitsbewältigung: Die Hakenkreuzschmierereien 1959/60 und das bundesdeutsche Verhältnis zum Nationalsozialismus," *Historisch-Politische Mitteilungen* 1, no. 1 (1994): 49–68.

1950s, as exemplified in articles published in the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*[191] and in *Volkskunde* handbooks, including Peuckert's own 1951 *Volkskunde. Quellen und Forschungen seit 1930*,[192] coauthored with Otto Lauffer.[193] Underlying the first chapter of that book, on the history, theory, and methodology of *Volkskunde*, is an insidious combination of defenses of the field: On the one hand is the assertion of unbroken, unproblematic continuity in the study of the *Volk*, from the Grimm brothers to Naumann, Spamer, and even Hitler.[194] On the other is an alignment with folklore research of the 1930s and 40s in other countries of Europe and the United States. The neutralizing, relegitimating effect of this presentation can be noted especially in Peuckert's highlighting of affinities between German *Volkskunde* and folklore studies in Switzerland and Sweden. Indeed, chronologically, the second major reference point in German *Volkskunde*'s postwar redirection remembered after Maus's article is Richard Weiß's textbook on Swiss *Volkskunde*,[195] which draws the German tradition together under one field unified by a common language, thereby cleansing Germany's reputation indirectly. Sigurd Erixon's work in Swedish folklife research (*folklivsforskning*) was, meanwhile, a well-established reference point for northern European folklorists already in the 1920s.[196]

---

[191] See, for instance, Viktor von Geramb, "Der Volksbegriff in der Geistesgeschichte und in der Volkskunde," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 50, no. 1/2 (1953): 7–34; Brepohl, "Die Geschichtlichkeit des Volkstums und der Gegenstand der Volkskunde"; Herbert Freudenthal, "Volkstum und Bildung," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 54, no. 1 (1958): 1–11; Alfred Karasek-Langer, "Volkskundliche Wandlungen in Deutschland," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 50, no. 1/2 (1953): 35–48. Of these authors, Brepohl, Freudenthal, and Karasek-Langer were active Nazis.

[192] Will-Erich Peuckert and Otto Lauffer, *Volkskunde: Quellen und Forschungen seit 1930* (Bern: Francke, 1951). See also the definition of *Volk* and *Volkskunde* offered in Erich and Beitl, *Wörterbuch der deutschen Volkskunde*, 799–809.

[193] Lauffer was chair of *Volkskunde* and *Altertumskunde* at the University of Hamburg from 1919 to 1947.

[194] Peuckert and Lauffer, *Volkskunde: Quellen und Forschungen seit 1930*, 8.

[195] Richard Weiss, *Volkskunde der Schweiz: Grundriss* (Erlenbach-Zürich: E. Rentsch, 1946).

[196] On Erixon's life and works, see Sigurd Erixon, *Erixoniana: Contributions to the Study of European Ethnology in Memory of Sigurd Erixon* (Arnhem, 1970). The significance of this Swedish tradition, not only for German *Volkskunde* but for European ethnology on the continent more broadly, will be treated in greater detail in Part III.

Both politically neutral in the war, but, like German *Volkskunde*, both dedicated to the study of Germanic culture, the foregrounding of Swiss and Swedish folklore research elides political and scientific morality, neutralizing Germany's *Volkskunde* by association. Moreover, this strategy of overcoming the past via integration into the international anthropological community would continue for decades, albeit with different trajectories.

Gerhard Lutz's 1958 *Volkskunde* handbook,[197] though it acknowledges the difficulties facing *Volkskunde*, similarly affects a sense of century-long continuity by laying out theoretical developments in Germany and Austria chronologically by decade, as captured in the reprinting of what he deems key articulations of *Volkskunde* theory from Riehl to the present.[198] What portions he writes himself include no explicit discussion of the glaring ideological rupture of the Nazi period beyond the level of allusion, for instance in referring to the "*Zusammenbruch*" (collapse) of 1945 and subsequent "*Neubeginn*" (new beginning) in his introduction.[199] Similar metaphorical language appears in his introduction to the last essay of the volume, by Austrian *Volkskundler* Viktor von Geramb (1937),[200] which Lutz frames as having been "the last great essay before the catastrophe and in a confused time."[201] Though the exchange

---

[197] Lutz, *Volkskunde: Ein Handbuch*. Further Scandinavian folklorists who had professional ties to German *Volkskunde* and whose work influenced the field include Carl Wilhelm von Sydow, Sigfrid Svennson, and Åke Campbell. See Weber-Kellermann, *Deutsche Volkskunde zwischen Germanistik und Sozialwissenschaften*, 87.

[198] The first chapter, an essay by Adolf Spamer, covers the roots of *Volkskunde*, but frames these with reference to Riehl's historiography of the field, who traces it back to Tacitus's *Germania*. However, as Lutz clarifies in his introduction to the essay, while descriptions of the German *Volk* extend to the classical period, "den gemeinsamen Mittelpunkt dieser Bemühungen fand und formulierte aber erst Riehl, wodurch die Volkskunde als Fachdisziplin begründet war . . ." Lutz, *Volkskunde: Ein Handbuch*, 14.

[199] Ibid., 9.

[200] Geramb was noted for assuming in 1931 the first *Volkskunde* Professur in the entire German-speaking world. He also engaged in postwar evaluations of *Volkskunde*'s central concept. von Geramb, "Der Volksbegriff in der Geistesgeschichte und in der Volkskunde."

[201] "der letzte große Aufsatz vor der Katastrophe und in einer verwirrten Zeit." Lutz, *Volkskunde: Ein Handbuch*, 202.

among German-speaking *Volkskundler* across different countries was historically commonplace, it is not insignificant that Lutz gives the final word to an Austrian, whose country could be looked upon as a victim of Nazism.

Finally, in an ostensibly pragmatic but suspiciously deflecting move, Lutz states in the concluding overview of *Volkskunde* since 1940 that he deliberately includes no exemplar essays as writings from that period, as these are already easily available to read without reprinting.[202] Euphemistically eliding *Volkskunde*'s work between 1940 and 1945 as having been hindered by historical circumstances[203]—an iteration of the German victim narrative—Lutz quickly concludes the book with a summary of the enormous changes following "de[m] politische[n] Umsturz" of 1945.[204] In this, he covers both classic objects of *Volkskunde* research as well as new problems of modern industrial society, including the "Begegnung von Einheimischen und Neusiedlern"[205]—that is, studies of the so-called German "*Heimatvertriebene*."[206]

Though Lutz situates the Maus-Peuckert antagonism as representing the leading trends in the field's postwar transformation, he mentions the exchange only briefly after he credits two non-Germans, Richard Weiß (Swiss) and Leopold Schmidt (Austrian),[207]

---

[202] Ibid., 229.

[203] His exact phrasing is: "durch die Zeitverhältnisse stark beeinträchtigen Weiterlaufen der Arbeit."

[204] "the political upheaval." Lutz, *Volkskunde: Ein Handbuch*, 229.

[205] "meeting of locals and new settlers."

[206] "people who were driven from their homeland." Lutz, *Volkskunde: Ein Handbuch*, 229. With this Lutz is likely alluding to the study of the postwar displacement of millions of Germans expelled from the East. The so-called *Volkskunde der Heimatvertriebenen* established by Alfred Karasek-Langer (coincidentally an active Nazi) after the war would briefly capture the interest of a subset of *Volkskundler*, Josef Hanika and Bruno Schier among them, as an answer to the search for new, contemporary objects of study. The topic ultimately would be abandoned amid the 1960s debate over cultural continuity, with its obvious resonances with Nazi cultural ideology. Examples of this subfield of research can be found in the now defunct *Jahrbuch für die Volkskunde der Heimatvertriebenen* sponsored by the Kommission für Volkskunde der Heimatvertriebenen in cooperation with the Verband der Vereine für Volkskunde.

[207] Specifically, Lutz cites Weiß 1946 *Volkskunde der Schweiz* and Leopold Schmidt, "Die Volkskunde als Geisteswissenschaft," *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Prähistorie* 73/77 (1947): 115–37. Again, while scholarly exchange among German-speaking *Volkskundler* was common, and the reason for the listing of Weiß and Schmidt before any German *Volkskundler*

with the first significant contributions to new thought in the field after World War II. Here again, then, we find a suggestion of exculpation via international association. In contrast, Maus's criticism is cast not as a contribution to ideas for new directions, but as an "attack" ("*Angriff*") that the *Volkskundler* Peuckert, a legitimate representative of the field, only answered in 1948.

Compared with Peuckert, Lutz's representation of *Volkskunde*'s history more readily, if only tacitly or metonymically, acknowledges the crisis in which the field finds itself after Nazism. However, in light of his reluctance to address the issue directly or thoroughly, Lutz's seemingly progressive intonation of the history of science as not only a matter of accumulated knowledge, but also of the historical conditions of a period, might also be read as a rhetorical deflection.[208] This framing was typical of 1950s *Volkskunde*; though other *Volkskundler* proposed solutions to the still only metonymically acknowledged crisis of legitimacy facing *Volkskunde*, few succeeded in moving beyond the narrative of victimhood, guilt-sorting, and unproblematized scientific and cultural continuity.[209]

Cast in subsequent historiography as a lone voice for practical change was Hans Moser, of the University of Munich. His 1954 article, "Gedanken zur heutigen Volkskunde: Ihre Situation, ihre Problematik, ihre Aufgaben,"[210] is remembered as the

---

ostensibly a matter of chronology, the implications of this association with *Volkskunde* outside of Germany are, first, neutralization and relegitimation, and second, a tacit recognition of the crisis of German *Volkskunde* coming out of the Nazi era

[208] Lutz, *Volkskunde: Ein Handbuch*, 5.

[209] This pattern can be traced, for instance, in the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*. In that journal, arguments for the continuing viability of the heretofore central theories that defined the field effectively stopped by the early 1960s as articles turned toward field research reports, suggesting that even if theory was deemed untenable, the methodology and purposeful documentation work of *Volkskunde* remained valid. The journal's leadership and articles through the 1950s furthermore indicated a changing of the guard, as the representative voices transitioned from leading *Volkskundler* of the Nazi period—John Meier, Otto Lauffer, Bruno Schier, and Wilhelm Brepohl, for example—to a new generation of increasingly critical scholars.

[210] Moser, "Gedanken zur heutigen Volkskunde." It should be noted that while the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* is frequently referenced in this study as a site for observing transitions in the field, it was only

first truly critical and productive engagement of *Volkskunde*'s crisis situation from within the field itself.[211] Though the article presents a lengthy review of significant *Volkskunde* research from Riehl to the present, gathering Swedish, Swiss, and Austrian contributions into the same field, Moser's historiography is aimed not at accounting for the sins of the Nazi period—though he points explicitly to the as yet unaddressed need to rehabilitate the politicized and discredited discipline—but rather at what should be the way forward for the field. Opening with the familiar tone of postwar *Kahlschlag* rhetoric, Moser's description of the challenges facing postwar *Volkskunde* resonate clearly with the reconstruction efforts and future-oriented concerns of the West German *Wirtschaftswunder*: how to rebuild *Volkskunde* upon a "materiellen und geistigen Trümmerfeld,"[212] how to overcome international isolation and national state division, and how to decide what of its past work should be continued and what new directions should be taken up.

Moser begins his argument by reviewing articulations of the postwar state and future possibilities for *Volkskunde*, starting with the Maus-Peuckert debate, which he frames in terms of the rejection of the former romanticizing perspective and the adoption of an interdisciplinary orientation (sociological, ethnological, psychological, historical). This, in turn, begs the question of *Volkskunde*'s status as an independent discipline with a unique and unified identity, methodology, and mission (set of *Aufgaben*).[213] To answer

---

one of many publishing organs for *Volkskundler*. Regional journals like the *Bayerisches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* were also major venues for research publishing.

[211] Helge Gerndt, for instance, reprints Moser's article along with Maus's, Peuckert's, and Schmidt's as the first four key articulations of *Volkskunde's* postwar state. Gerndt, *Fach und Begriff "Volkskunde."*

[212] "field of material and mental / spiritual rubble." Moser, "Gedanken zur heutigen Volkskunde," 208.

[213] Here is it worth mentioning a case of the process of institutional forgetting: In his discussion of other perspectives on the state of the field, Moser also cites similar articles published around the same time by Bonn *Volkskundler* Karl Meisen: Karl Meisen, "Der gegenwärtige Stand der wissenschaftlichen Volkskunde," *Rheinisches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 3 (1952): 7ff.; Meisen, "Europäische Volkskunde als Forschungsaufgabe." While Moser appears to approve of Meisen's proposed return to Riehl's notion of *Volkskunde* as a still half-finished creation ("eine halb vollendete Schöpfung") requiring not only a new,

this question should be the field's number one priority, he concludes.[214] In other words, *Volkskunde* must settle on a unified identity and prove its worth as an independent field ("*Grundwissenschaft*") in order to continue pursuing any mission, scientific or social / applied. Still, *Volkskunde*, he argues, is not threatened so much by stagnation as by the overly broad dispersal of research orientations and objects that characterize the initial response to its delegitimation after the fall of the Nazi regime.[215]

Moser offers a thorough review of the many proposals for, or examples of, what *Volkskunde*'s disciplinary identity could or should be going forward. He then concludes with his own program for *Volkskunde*'s future direction. Like Peuckert, Lutz, and other early defenders of the field, Moser sees West Germany's *Volkskunde* within the same frame as other Germanophone traditions, as well as Scandinavian folklore studies.[216] But

---

but a genuinely solid and unified scientific identity, he dismisses Meisen's interest in mythology and other cultural stereotypes as dangerously resonant with racial *Volkskunde* (Moser, "Gedanken zur heutigen Volkskunde," 212-213)—an early intonation of the Folklorismus-Debatte Moser would initiate that would prove a turning point for the field. (For Moser's interpretation of the fuller meaning of Riehl's expression, see Moser, "Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl und die Volkskunde," 42–47.) Subsequent historiography likewise would place Meisen among the generation of old, Nazi-era *Volkskundler*—Brepohl, Lauffer, and the like—whose ideas for new directions were only perfunctory and potentially dangerous in their retroactivity. See, for instance, Gustav Schöck, "Sammeln und Retten: Anmerkungen zu zwei Prinzipien volkskundlicher Empirie," in *Abschied vom Volksleben* (Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1970), 85. Although Meisen would appear to be a potential legitimate contributor to postwar *Volkskunde*—he was fired from his academic position in 1939, but then established Bonn's *Volkskunde* seminar in 1945 and directed the first *Volkskunde* journal to reopen after the war (the *Rheinisches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde*)—he and his school would be overshadowed by the younger, more progressive and outspoken departments in sociologically oriented Tübingen and historically oriented Munich. For Meisen's biography, see Heinrich Leonard Cox, "Karl Meisen," *Neue Deutsche Biographie* (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 1990), http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd139781196.html.

[214] Among all of the proposed *Aufgaben* for *Volkskunde* in circulation by that time, however, the one Moser identifies as the priority is "daß sie ihre innere Problematik überwindet und sich darüber klar wird, wo ihre wesensgemäße Bestimmung, ihre Mitte und ihre Stärke liegt." Moser, "Gedanken zur heutigen Volkskunde," 232.

[215] Ibid., 215.

[216] This is not to mean expanding the scope of *Volkskunde* research to encompass all of Europe (which would be a danger, not a boon, to *Volkskunde* (Ibid., 217), but to engage with the work of *Volkskundler* from other parts of Europe. Moser is extremely preoccupied with the problem of maintaining clear boundaries for German (which for him is German-speaking) *Volkskunde*. How precisely he frames this issue will be discussed in Part III.

while Moser also credits Weiß and Schmidt for contributing the earliest constructive suggestions for the future of the field,[217] this association does not have the facile, defensive character of eliding politicized German *Volkskunde* with more neutral Swiss, Austrian, and Scandinavian schools. In fact, Moser points out what he sees as their shared shortcomings with German *Volkskunde*. He distinguishes his proposed approach from current Swedish *folklivsforskning* (folklife studies) and from the presentist German *Volkskunde* pursued before World War II, both of which seek / sought to identify the present manifestations of timeless tradition, and asserts instead the unique historicity of each present moment.[218]

Moser's take on the relation between history and the present forms the crux of his plan for disciplinary reform: to reinvigorate the field's historicizing perspective, as opposed to following a sociological direction that Maus proposes (which, like Peuckert, he dismisses as failing on its Marxist-materialist bent). But while Moser sides with Peuckert in defending *Volkskunde*'s postwar independence and in casting *Volkskunde* as a fundamentally historical discipline, the historicizing orientation he advocates does not rest on the oversimplifying notion of cultural continuity that was the classic model of German historical anthropology. Moser sees as *Volkskunde*'s mission not to seek some hypothetical historical trajectory of "Elementargedanken, Urformen, und Ursymbole," nor to study synchronically contemporary cultural phenomena (urbanization, industry, postwar population displacement, etc.), but rather to describe in exact detail the history of

---

[217] Moser, "Gedanken zur heutigen Volkskunde," 210.

[218] As Moser states: "Alle Erscheinungen des Volkstums sind ständigen Wandlungen unterworfen und sind an ganz bestimmte Zeitspannen gebunden, wobei geistesgeschichtliche, wirtschaftliche, soziale, herrschaftliche Beeinflussungen mit hereinspielen und einer Untersuchung nicht nur ihrer Formen, sondern mehr noch ihrer zwangsläufig oder bereitwillig hingenommenen Wirkungen bedürfen." ("All manifestations of folklore are subject to constant change and are bound to very specific timespans, whereby historical, economic, social, stately influences play a role. Study is thus required not only of its forms, but much more of the effects of its forced or voluntarily toleratation thereof.") Ibid., 228–229.

present *Volkskultur*.[219] As he states, "For history indeed encompasses not only that which has transpired, but also that which is transpiring. . . . We experience this historicity today before our eyes."[220] This redirection and refining of the historicizing mission of *Volkskunde* would be the base for the so-called "Munich School" of *Volkskunde* that Moser cofounded with Karl-Sigismund Kramer.

This concept of historicizing *Volkskunde* would also inform Moser's instigation of the so-called "*Folklorismus-Debatte*" ("folklorism debate") of the early 1960s. The crux of the debate was the reflexive realization that *Volkskundler*, while purporting to document cultural artifacts and traditions, were in fact helping to construct them, and with that the image of German *Volk* and the very notion of the traditional. Folklorism, in Moser's words, is the "second-hand mediation and presentation of folk culture."[221] This was a groundbreaking criticism of the fundamental nature of *Volkskunde*, both past and present, and hinted strongly at the field's complicity with National Socialist ideology.[222]

---

[219] "elementary thoughts, primordial (*Ur*-) forms, and primordial (*Ur*-) symbols." Ibid., 217–218.

[220] "Denn Geschichte umfaßt ja nicht nur das Geschehene, sondern auch das Geschehende. . . . Wir erleben diese Geschichtlichkeit heute vor unseren Augen." Ibid., 220.

[221] "die Vermittlung und Vorführung von Volkskultur aus zweiter Hand." Hans Moser, "Vom Folklorismus in unserer Zeit," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*, 1962, 180. The debate would continue through the 1960s, especially in the work of Hermann Bausinger, who reframed the notion in terms of the problem of historical continuity. Hermann Bausinger, "Kritik der Tradition: Anmerkungen zur Situation der Volkskunde," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 65 (1969): 232–50; Hermann Bausinger and Wolfgang Brückner, eds., *Kontinuität? Geschichtlichkeit und Dauer als volkskundliches Problem* (Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1969). See also Volume 1965, Issue 1 (1969) of the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* that discusses *Folklorismus* across the anthropologies of Europe. For a fuller discussion of the trajectory of critiques of folklorism in West Germany and beyond, see Regina F. Bendix, "Folklorism: The Challenge of a Concept," *International Folklore Review* 6 (1988): 5–15; Guntis Šmidchens, "Folklorism Revisited," *Journal of Folklore Research* 36, no. 1 (1999): 51–70. A later iteration of the problem of notions of "culture" in public discourse is Wolfgang Kaschuba's critique of "culturalism." Where "folklorism" is the construction of cultural artifacts for public consumption, "culturalism" is the public adaptation of anthropological concepts to explain, excuse, normalize, or pathologize social phenomena, including violence. Wolfgang Kaschuba, "Kulturalismus: Vom Verschwinden des Sozialen im gesellschaftlichen Diskurs," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 91 (1995): 27–45; Eggmann, *"Kultur"-Konstruktionen*.

[222] Wolfgang Kaschuba makes this connection explicitly. Kaschuba, *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*, 143.

Moser was strongly attacked for his audacity.[223] Like his immediate predecessors, he does not delve into the specifics of how *Volkskunde* came to its present crisis of identity and legitimacy, but unlike them, he offers a sincere and actionable critique of efforts (and nonefforts) to reform the field up to that point. It is for this reason that, already in the historiography of the 1960s,[224] he would be remembered positively as the lone critical voice of the 1950s and a leader of the internal, institutional vanguard of disciplinary reform.

SUMMARY

This review of the basic narratives in the historiography of *Volkskunde* published in the first fifteen postwar years points to key decisions about which narratives could actually be performed. Overall, there were three possible narratives available to deal with the discipline's complicity in the Nazi era. The first was the silence of supposed normalcy or "business as usual," as *Volkskundler* continued to go about their work after quietly shedding or reframing unacceptable projects and politically questionable scholars. This position had its advantages, since German *Volkskunde*'s institutional existence depended on outside forces during this time (namely, the Allied Occupiers and the international scientific community), and since there were few resources to generate innovations in theory and methodology.

As a result of this silence, however, the field saw little change and even regression, which fostered in the immediate postwar decade the emergence of a reactive

---

[223] See Moser, "Vom Folklorismus in unserer Zeit"; Hans Moser, *Der Folklorismus als Forschungsproblem der Volkskunde* (Giessen: Schmitz, 1964). See also Kaschuba, *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*, 82–83; Bendix, "Folklorism."

[224] See, for instance, Utz Jeggle's essay in Gottfried Korff, Utz Jeggle, and Klaus Geiger, eds., *Abschied vom Volksleben* (Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1970), 29.

historiographic discourse. This discourse tacitly acknowledged a crisis of legitimacy without necessarily charting a way forward, other than to clarify and resituate key disciplinary concepts in order to redeem the field by disassociating from its political entanglements. Except for a couple of isolated exceptions (Maus and Moser), this initial narrative performance of "normalcy" sustained *Volkskunde*'s own version of the *Sonderweg* argument, establishing the discipline as continuous and German, but without addressing the ineffaceable rupture of Nazi politicization. By shunting the question of its alignment with Nazi ideologies onto the decisions of individuals, *Volkskunde* managed to sustain itself as a discipline through the early postwar period, but that performance simply deferred the emergence of its reckoning with that past.

Nonetheless, to dismiss this situation as indicating a lack of serious and probing self-critique in the early postwar years is to overlook the field's actual activity. For, what did not happen for the discipline as a whole did indeed begin to happen at the micro level, whereby small correctives were implemented that acknowledged how the field's key concepts had been co-opted in service of the National Socialist regime. Often, this corrective work was conducted in a defensive or perfunctory way, and sometimes with restorative overtones, as we witnessed in Peuckert's response to Maus. In that sense, the field, like the rest of German society and the subculture of intellectuals, did move forward, but without yet fully admitting the need for reform on a large, uniform scale. As Maus suggests and Moser's lone effort substantiates, the majority of *Volkskundler* indeed seemed unwilling to cause disruption and claim a distinctive exculpatory narrative, probably in order to limit their losses. They were thus even willing to continue claiming (or trying to claim) the institutional prominence and public visibility that the field had enjoyed with Nazi support, even as they worked to reclaim a depoliticized, independent legitimacy for their field by recalling its foundations in the latter nineteenth century.

Yet even the retellings of the discipline's history for the postwar era—charting *Volkskunde*'s rise from Riehl's resurrected notion of *Volkskunde* as an applied scientific discipline to Maus's outsider critique—remained rife with deflecting narratives of victimhood, guilt-parsing, and future-planning that did not permit a revision of the discipline's identity as scientific practice, but rather simply translated the *Aufgabe* of *Volkskunde* from one of (willing or unwilling) nation-building to the support of human society on a universal level. In this sense, the discipline moved backwards rather than forward, returning to its even deeper roots in the Enlightenment and narrating its identity as what the rest of the West would call a neoliberal fallacy of essentializing, universal humanism.[225]

These early trends in the narratives purportedly supporting a postwar disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* were further bolstered by West German *Volkskunde*'s choice to reassert its links with other national traditions, in particular those that had drawn on earlier forms of prewar German *Volkskunde*. Such prewar connections were mobilized to suggest the existence of variants of the discipline that were supposedly less tainted and more neutral than Germany's quasi-*Sonderweg Volkskunde*, especially the versions of the discipline available in Austria, Switzerland, and Scandinavia.

When more substantial discussion of *Volkskunde*'s methodology and theory arose, especially regarding its place next to other social and historical sciences, the prevailing historiographic narratives rarely questioned the boundaries of the discipline or the objects

[225] It is worth noting that Germany's community of *Völkerkundler* / *Ethnologen* adopted an official position very similar to that of the *Volkskundler*, professing that they "uphold that free and unbiased [*sic*] research which had been banned in this country during the past twelve years" and "unanimously concur in the opinion that it is the duty of every German to offer his active contribution to the support and promotion of world peace," a mission to which the field also commits to applying its research, past and present, with the support of the international community of ethnologists. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Völkerkunde, "Public Manifesto of German Ethnologists Assembled at Frankfort from September 19th–21st 1946," *Royal Anthropological Institute, Honorary Officers' Correspondence and Papers (A95–03 of 05)*, 1946.

of its analysis. Instead, in continuing an established discourse reaching back one hundred years to Riehl, the question of interdisciplinarity would ultimately be avoided as more of a risk than a support to the field's independence. The general trend in the immediate postwar period, then, is a translation of prewar disciplinary discourses into the tropes associated with *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* that were familiar to postwar intellectuals and society as a whole. In the next chapter, we will see how this trend of adapting broader West German discourses of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* exploded with the 1968 protest movements. There, again, new narrative tropes for the field's historiography would emerge parallel to those in the national public and intellectual discourses about the Nazi past, including questions of guilt, and definitions of complicity and collaboration. Yet, in contrast to discourses from *Volkskunde*'s historiographic narratives of first fifteen postwar years, the discipline's new, post-1968 engagement with its Nazi-era past would have lasting repercussions not only for the epistemic-, but especially for the institutional structuring of the field. Thereafter, the last chapter of Part I will show how the trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* from the 1980s onward would be translated into another set of discourse tropes and practices to recast *Volkskunde*'s identity as part of more "normalized" and international ethnographic science.

Chapter 2:

Vergangenheitsbewältigung, 1960–1980

The previous chapter discussed how variations of the trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in *Volkskunde*'s early postwar historiographic narratives indexed public streams of that trope, specifically the victimizing notion of starting over at *Stunde Null*, silence concerning the Nazi period, debates about Germany's *Sonderweg* as a nation-state, and efforts to quickly rebuild and reintegrate in the international political and economic system as a means of overcoming the recent past and returning to some semblance of normalcy. Like other fields of postwar public and intellectual culture,[226] *Volkskunde* could not successfully actualize the *Stunde Null* discourse claiming a fresh beginning and ignoring the rubble. Yet, precisely because the majority of the field's leaders insisted that a salvageable historical continuity with prewar *Volkskunde*—and even elements of the field during National Socialist rule—was available, the field's epistemic structures remained relatively stable even as the bureaucratic structures were being rebuilt with outside oversight. Nonetheless, critical discussions of the discipline's

[226] For a case study of how other intellectual fields had to rebuild after World War II, see Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *In a Cold Crater Cultural and Intellectual Life in Berlin, 1945–1948* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

identity and *Aufgaben*—past, present, and future—occasionally punctured the silence concerning the field's service to the Third Reich.

By the early 1960s, West German public discourse concerning the cultural, political, and economic aftermath of World War II was beginning to shift as the second postwar generation was coming of age. In his 2013 monograph, *West Germany and the Global Sixties*, Timothy Scott Brown summarizes the major features of the period:

> In the historiography on West Germany, 1968 is clearly established as a watershed event. Rebelling against a stifling atmosphere of cultural conformity, challenging anti-Communist Cold War hysteria, and demanding an accounting with the crimes of the Nazi era, young West Germans demanded nothing less than a democratic renewal of society from the ground up. Such demands, explosive wherever they were made, acquired a special potency in a West Germany poised precipitously on the front line of the Cold War and struggling with the legacy of a recent past marked by fascism, war, and genocide. In challenging the older generation about its complicity in the crimes of the Nazi era, the 68er helped spur dialogue on democratization that profoundly affects German society to the present day.[227]

Historian Tony Judt maintains that the reform movements of "1968," though represented in media and remembered today as a poignant moment of cultural rupture, were at the time a relatively isolated cultural phenomenon that was ultimately ineffective in attaining its political goals.[228] For its part, the West German government ignored these demands, only fueling the rancor of young leftist leaders, which eventually erupted in student

---

[227] Timothy Scott Brown, *West Germany and the Global Sixties: The Anti-Authoritarian Revolt, 1962–1978*, New Studies in European History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 4–5. For a poignant literary reference to the continuing permeation of fascism in postwar society, see Siegfried Lenz, *Deutschstunde: Roman* (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1968).

[228] Judt states, for instance: "From both sides of the Iron Curtain the children of the Sixties—i.e. the core cohort of the baby-boomer generation, born between 1946 and 1951—certainly looked back with affection upon 'their' decade and continued to harbor fond memories and an exaggerated sense of its significance. . . But those too young to recall the Sixties were often resentful of the solipsistic self-aggrandizement of its aging memorialists." Tony Judt, *Postwar: A History of Europe since 1945* (New York: Penguin, 2005), 750–751.

protests centered around the Extraparliamentary Opposition (Ausserparliamentarische Opposition, APO) and even domestic terrorism most commonly associated with the Red Army Faction (Rote Armee Fraktion, RAF). Although there were some spaces of democratization—for instance, in the expansion of university access in the 1960s and the building of new universities in the 1970s[229]—for the most part political leaders strove to maintain the status quo. Against this historical background, the present chapter will examine how *Volkskunde*'s historiographic narratives evolved in the second postwar generation to more strongly matched patterns of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* discourse, both critical and conservative.

The explosion of disciplinary self-criticism in the 1960s focused largely on the ideological implications of Nazi-era cultural theory.[230] In contrast to the period covered in the last chapter, *Volkskunde*'s self-critique in the 1960s/70s would have significant and wide-reaching effects on the field's institutional and epistemic structures. While Moser's critical evaluation and the Munich School's commitment to a new kind of historical *Volkskunde* won a place in institutional memory as the earliest sincere proposal for a way forward out of the shadows of Nazi science,[231] the field's discursive center of gravity would shift strongly in the 1960s to a different, and still dominating, institution: the Institut für Empirische Kulturwissenschaft at the University of Tübingen. There, a young generation of *Volkskundler* participated in the instigating rumbles of the West German student protest movement. Though Tübingen would not be the only site of forceful

---

[229] On West German university reforms in the 1960s/70s, see Kommunistischer Studentenverband, *Die Formierte Universität: Hochschulreform in der BRD und Westberlin* (Cologne: Verlag Wissenschaft im Klassenkampf, 1977); Thomas Ellwein, *Die deutsche Universität vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart* (Wiesbaden: Fourier, 1997), 243–263. On the history of an exemplary reform university, see Peter Meier-Hüsing, *Universität Bremen 40 Jahre in Bewegung* (Bremen: Ed. Temmen, 2011).

[230] This is the second emplotment identified by Stein in her short study of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in *Volkskunde* historiography. Stein, "Coming to Terms with the Past."

[231] See, for instance, Kaschuba, *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*, 82–83.

engagement, the institute's the critical pronouncements and proposals for reconfiguring *Volkskunde* would become a reference point for subsequent debates about disciplinary identity up to the present day.

Among the more prominent elements of this turn in internal disciplinary debate was its intersection with a broader public discursive repertoire of political strategies useful for redefining the discipline's identity. Most significant among these were the contrasting formulations of antifascism, with those on the left of the political spectrum criticizing the continuing presence of fascist elements in positions of national power, and those on the right arguing that the Nazi regime and Soviet Communism—implicating East Germany as well—functioned on the same level of totalitarianism. This split trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in the 1960s/70s would be translated variously to serve both the left-leaning camp of *Volkskunde* in its call for radical reform, and the right-leaning camp in defending a more continuous model of traditional *Volkskunde*.

The field's division along the lines of political orientation would yield the most tangible structural result of the 1960s/70s debates among West German *Volkskundler*: the field's fracturing into several distinct, competing though not necessarily adversarial, theoretical and methodological networks. This splintering would be expressed in a variety of new institute titles indicating positions both toward the field's national past and its various paths toward integration into the international anthropological community. The conversion from *Volkskunde* to a so-called "*Vielnamenfach*" ("field of many names"—coined in the early 1990s to describe the splintered state of the field)[232] at first strongly reflected the polarized political perspectives of the time concerning the Nazi past and West Germany's present and future identity. However, as both national and disciplinary

[232] The concept of *Vielnamenfach* will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.

debates cooled in the late 1970s and early 1980s, the field's split status would be translated in institutional memory as scientific differences of research orientation and methodology.

Also implicated in *Volkskunde*'s institutional fracturing was a translation of the significance of the field's international associations. Beginning in the mid-1960s, efforts to embed German anthropology in an international context shifted focus from the German-speaking and Nordic traditions, as a neutralizing strategy, to the increasingly dominant Anglophone and Francophone traditions of folklore studies and cultural anthropology, as a measure of the field's modernization. It would be wrong to assume, however, that the progress of cultural theory in postwar West German *Volkskunde* was simply a matter of discarding German models and replacing them with whatever was internationally *au courant*. Debates about *Volkskunde*'s Nazi past from the mid-1960s onward played out not only in unprecedented, overt historical self-criticism, but also via local attempts at new theories of culture situated in the international anthropological (and, increasingly, sociological) community, the German tradition, or in conversation with both.

A third translation surrounding *Volkskunde*'s reformation concerns the field's rigorous engagement with methodology, posited by both sides of the 1960s ideological divide as the field's saving grace[233]—a salvageable continuity and unique contribution to research that sets the field apart from other cultural, social, and historical disciplines in

[233] Among the many champions of *Volkskunde*'s methodological rigor was Gerhard Heilfurth, whose defense of the field's methodological strength was stated in terms of continuity (as opposed to tradition) and as an alternative to ideological criticism. Gerhard Heilfurth, "Volkskunde jenseits der Ideologien: Zum Problemstand des Faches im Blickfeld empirischer Forschung," *Hessische Blätter für Volkskunde* 53 (1962): 9–28. This perspective contrasted with the more progressive camp, associated most readily with the Ludwig-Uhland Institut für Volkskunde at the University of Tübingen, which framed the call for empiricism as a solution to the untenability of *Volk* theory. See, for instance, Korff, Jeggle, and Geiger, *Abschied vom Volksleben*.

Germany, and other national traditions of folklore studies and cultural anthropology. In this way, the empiricist turn in 1950s *Volkskunde* would be judged in institutional memory both negatively—as a defensive maneuver and indicator of permanently untenable traditional theory[234]—and positively—as a strong tradition that marks postwar Germany's *Volkskunde* as a rigorous science.[235] Let us turn now to examine the discursive contours and structural implications of *Volkskunde*'s participation in the social and political rupture associated with the West German "1968."

THE SWELLING OF SECOND-WAVE *VERGANGENHEITSBEWÄLTIGUNG*

Firmly established in the institutional memory of West German *Volkskunde*'s "1968" is the Ludwig-Uhland Institut für Volkskunde, established in 1960 by Germanist Hermann Bausinger at the University of Tübingen.[236] Founded by the National Socialist regime in 1933 as a major arm of its racial and cultural propaganda machine, Tübingen's *Volkskunde* institute would in the postwar period have the advantage of a clean slate as it was more thoroughly reformed by the French Occupying forces in the de-Nazification process than other, less "belastete" institutes.[237] Populated by a younger, critical

---

[234] Gottfried Korff, Utz Jeggle, and Klaus Geiger, eds., *Abschied vom Volksleben* (Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1970), 8; Hermann Bausinger, "Zur Theoriefeindlichkeit in der Volkskunde," *Ethnologia Europaea* 2/3 (1968/69): 55–58; Dow, "There Is No Grand Theory in Germany, and for Good Reason." Dow's suggestion that the field's emphasis on methodology is a kind of coping mechanism for never having reestablished its own theoretical profile is still lamented and even resented by *Volkskundler* and *Europäische Ethnologen* in Germany today, as I observed in my experiences studying at and visiting the institutes between 2002 and 2011.

[235] Later sites of the positive translation of the field's turn toward rigorous empiricism include: Ina-Maria Greverus, ed., *Forschendes Lernen und der Studentenberg: Aus dem Alltag eines Uni-Institutes* (Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie, 1980); Schmidt-Lauber, "Seeing, Hearing, Feeling, Writing: Approaches and Methods from the Perspective of Ethnological Analysis of the Present."

[236] Critical Tübingen associates include Utz Jeggle, Gottfried Korff, Martin Scharfe, and Konrad Köstlin.

[237] As Bausinger himself describes it, he—and by implication the Tübingen school he founded—profited from the "vacuum" left at the institute in the immediate postwar years when he was a postdoctoral *Assistent*. Hermann Bausinger, *Ein Aufklärer des Alltags: Der Kulturwissenschaftler Hermann Bausinger*

generation of researchers, the institute would become the major source of disciplinary agitation and eventually structural fracture by engaging in rigorous historiographic criticism, on the one hand, and by spearheading a new direction in theory and methodology, on the other hand. This new direction included a shift in focus from "folklife" (*Volksleben*), with its overtones of unbroken continuity of mythic tradition earlier criticized by Moser,[238] and toward everyday life in modern society, supported in part by a theoretical affinity with Frankfurt School critical sociology.[239]

---

im Gespräch mit Wolfgang Kaschuba, Gudrun M. König, Dieter Langewiesche und Bernhard Tschofen (Vienna: Böhlau, 2006), 22. Reinhard Johler further clarified in an interview how the French Occupiers directed the institute's reformation—including giving it the name of an early nineteeth-century German poet, philologist and literary historian, Johann Ludwig Uhland—for the purpose of continuing to provide a "Volksbildung" for the German people. Reinhard Johler, interview by Amanda Randall, May 18, 2011.

[238] Bausinger's own engagement with the problem of continuity in *Volkskunde* research is articulated in the *Festschrift* for Hans Moser. Bausinger and Brückner, *Kontinuität?*. See also his essays on the *Folklorismus-Debatte* in Hermann Bausinger, ed., *Populus revisus: Beiträge zur Erforschung der Gegenwart. Arbeitstagung des Ludwig-Uhland-Instituts (Tübingen, Univ.) Ende April 1966 mit dem Rahmenthema: "Das Volksleben unserer Zeit"* (Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1966), 61–75; Hermann Bausinger, "Folklorismus in Europa: Eine Umfrage," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 65, no. 1 (1969): 1–8. It may seem suprising that Bausinger collaborated on the edition with Wolfgang Brückner, who would become a vehement adversary of the left-leaning Tübingen School. But the one thing they could agree on was that Hans Moser and the Munich School made a positive difference for the field. For Brückner's writing on the Folklorismus Debatte, see Wolfgang Brückner, "'Heimat und Demokratie': Gedanken zum politischen Folklorismus in Westdeutschland," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 62, no. 1 (1965): 205–13.

[239] On the history of the rise of the Frankfurt School as the international leader in postwar Critical Theory, see Clemens Albrecht, *Die Intellektuelle Gründung der Bundesrepublik: Eine Wirkungsgeschichte der Frankfurter Schule* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 1999). Still today, the Ludwig-Uhland Institut für Empirische Kulturwissenschaft (renamed from the Institut für Volkskunde in 1971) presents itself as the vanguard of 1960s disciplinary reform. The self-description on the institute's web site reads, for example, "Das 'LUI' und die hier vertretene 'EKW' stehen für eine bundesweit einmalige und für andere Institutionen vorbildhafte Modernisierung des Faches Volkskunde, seine disziplinäre Öffnung und internationale Ausrichtung." On the English version of the site, the description continues: "The department was one of the first in Germany to deal critically (and self-critically) with folklore studies under the National Socialist regime. This resulted in the field's modernization through a reorientation towards Critical Theory and social-scientific methods in the study of contemporary issues in the 1960s and 1970s." Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, "Institut und Fach," *Ludwig-Uhland-Institut für Empirische Kulturwissenschaft*, accessed April 17, 2015, http://www.wiso.uni-tuebingen.de/faecher/empirische-kulturwissenschaft/institut.html; Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, "Institute and Discipline," *Ludwig-Uhland-Institut für Empirische Kulturwissenschaft*, accessed April 17, 2015, http://www.uni-tuebingen.de/en/faculties/economics-and-social-sciences/subjects/historical-and-cultural-anthropology/institut.html.

Though Hermann Bausinger had begun articulating his critique of *Volkskunde*'s ideological tainting under Nazism in his 1961 *Habilitationsschrift*, entitled *Volkskultur in der technischen Welt*,[240] the beginning of his—and the Tübingen institute's—dedicated exorcising of *Volkskunde*'s Nazi past is typically marked at Bausinger's 1965 article "Volksideologie und Volksforschung: Zur nationalsozialistischen Volkskunde" in the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*.[241] He opens the essay by challenging the distinction drawn by Peuckert in the early postwar years, but by Gerhard Heilfurth more recently,[242] between what Bausinger calls "*Volksforschung*"—which he defines as a "solide, maßvolle und objektive Wissenschaft"—and "*Volksideologie*"—which he defines as the "tendenziöse Umbiegung [der Volksforschung] auf die politischen Interessen des Dritten Reiches."[243]

Contesting this self-serving dichotomy, Bausinger echoes (and eventually cites[244]) Maus's 1946 critique by stating that "National Socialism did not bring in some foreign ideas, nor did it even strengthen peripheral elements, but rather fully underscored central ideas of this scientific discipline."[245] The implication of this deep entanglement of

---

[240] Hermann Bausinger, *Volkskultur in der technischen Welt* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1961). In this work, Bausinger introduces a new model of cultural research that takes the modern world as its object. He grounds this new vision for the field in a critique of *Volkskunde*'s primary theoretical models up to that point.

[241] Hermann Bausinger, "Volksideologie und Volksforschung: Zur Nationalsozialistischen Volkskunde," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 61, no. 2 (1965): 177–204. The article was in fact an expanded version of a talk Bausinger gave as part of a university-wide conference on National Socialism and the sciences. The full conference is documented in Andreas Flitner, ed., *Deutsches Geistesleben und Nationalsozialismus: Eine Vortragsreihe der Universität Tübingen* (Tübingen: Wunderlich, 1965). That collection would serve as the discursive artifact for one of the earliest analyses of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* discourse, Wolfgang Fritz Haug's *Der hilflose Antifaschismus: Zur Kritik der Vorlesungsreihen über Wissenschaft und NS an deutschen Universitäten*, 2. überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage, Edition Suhrkamp 236 (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1968).

[242] Bausinger cites specifically Gerhard Heilfurth's 1962 article, "Volkskunde jenseits der Ideologien: Zum Problemstand des Faches im Blickfeld empirischer Forschung."

[243] "solid, measured, and objective science"; "tendentious bending [of folk-research] toward the political interests of the Third Reich." Bausinger, "Volksideologie und Volksforschung: Zur Nationalsozialistischen Volkskunde," 177.

[244] Ibid., 202; Maus, "Zur Situation der deutschen Volkskunde."

[245] The full quote reads: "Während in vielen anderen Wissenschaften die nationalsozialistische Wendung sich deutlich als Einbruch von ausßen präsentiert, ist hier zumindest mit der Möglichkeit zu rechnen, daß

scientific ideas and political ideologies is, according to Bausinger, that, more than any other discipline, *Volkskunde* must engage honestly and critically with its Nazi past. With that, Bausinger outlines in their full historical contexts—from Grimm Brothers and Riehl to their most recent formulations—the major issues, concepts, and figures that should be addressed in this urgent disciplinary self-critique, all centered on the notion of *Volk* and its ultimately deadly eliding of race, space, folk traditions, and national culture.[246]

But while Bausinger's evaluation of disciplinary history resonates with Maus's critique of the ideological nature of the "*Volk*" concept, his historiographic outline attempts to inject greater nuance—not to exonerate, but rather to illuminate the intricacies of *Volkskunde*'s entanglement in the project of National Socialism. Ultimately, Bausinger rejects the sociologist's proposal to dissolve the field precisely because he believes that, "If *Volkskunde* is the place where National Socialist thinking ran riot, then it is also the place where ideological elements must be uncovered and solid theories developed."[247] That is, given the field's undeniably deep and intricate entanglement in Nazism, it must endeavor more than any other field—even become a model among the sciences—to practice critical, historical self-reflection. There is also an element of social reflexivity in this proposal, for Bausinger views *Volkskunde* also as having a practical purpose (*Aufgabe*) in critiquing popular *völkische* ideology, for instance in the activities of folk societies.[248] In this way, in contrast to his predecessors Maus, Peuckert, and Moser,

---

der Nationalsozialismus nicht etwa fremde Ideen hereintrug, auch nicht etwa nur periphere Elemente verstärkte, sondern durchaus zentrale Gedanken dieser wissenschaftlichen Disziplin herausstrich. Dies mach die Auseinandersetzung mit der nationalsozialistischen Wissenschaft in der Volkskunde unvermeidlicher als in anderen Diszsiplinen." Bausinger, "Volksideologie und Volksforschung: Zur Nationalsozialistischen Volkskunde," 177.

246 Ibid., 198.

247 Bausinger states: "Wenn die Volkskunde der Ort war, an dem sich nationalsozialistische Gedankengänge mit am stärksten austobten, dann ist sie auch der Ort, an dem ideologische Bestandteile aufgedeckt und solide Theorien entwickelt werden müssen.") Ibid., 202.

248 Ibid., 203–204.

Bausinger imagines the field's usefulness not in some vague, universal humanistic sense, but rather explicitly as *Volkskunde* introducing a new concept of German culture in West Germany via a self-critical historiography of the country's native cultural science.

Bausinger's article is emblematic of the institute's vanguard status in actualizing the spirit of the broader 1960s anti-totalitarian revolution in the shape of disciplinary reform.[249] But the mid-1960s to the early 1970s was really a period of prolific disciplinary historiographic critique and self-searching for the field of *Volkskunde* as a whole. Moreover, recent historiography purports that West Germany's *Volkskunde* was ahead of the curve in disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* among the country's scientific communities.[250] Thus, in contrast to Hans Moser and the Munich School in the 1950s, Bausinger was not a lone voice of critique, nor was the *Volkskunde* faculty at Tübingen the only community engaging the problem of *Volkskunde*'s crisis of identity and legitimacy. However, the tropes of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* framing the reactions to that crisis were as diverse as the reactions to Germany's past within broader West German society: from the most staunch conservativism to the most radical reformist.

---

[249] Bausinger also was loosely networked with the *Gruppe 47* authors, in particular Martin Walser. Bausinger, *Ein Aufklärer des Alltags*, 19. Tübingen's domination of *Volkskunde* historiography also may have to do with the rigorous international public relations efforts undertaken by its representatives beginning in the 1960s. See, for instance, Hermann Bausinger, "Folklore Research at the University of Tübingen: On the Activities of the Ludwig-Uhland-Institut," trans. William Templer, *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 5, no. 2/3 (1968): 124–33. For a list of Bausinger's publications from 1951 to 2006, including translations into eight other languages, see Bausinger, *Ein Aufklärer des Alltags*, 201–225.

[250] Regina Bendix, one of the main contemporary historiographers of *Volkskunde* today, publishing both in German and English, observed that *Volkskundler* in at least some corners of the field were decades ahead of other sciences in confronting their field's fascist past and remain prolific in disciplinary historiography. Though Bendix does not name it explicitly, the field of *Ethnologie* (formerly *Völkerkunde*) engaged its Nazi entanglements rather belatedly and briefly compared with *Volkskunde*. See Hans Fischer, *Völkerkunde im Nationalsozialismus: Aspekte der Anpassung, Affinität und Behauptung einer wissenschaftlichen Disziplin* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1990); Thomas Hauschild, *Lebenslust und Fremdenfurcht: Ethnologie im Dritten Reich* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1995); Bernhard Streck, ed., *Ethnologie und Nationalsozialismus* (Gehren: Escher, 2000). For a list of more recent disciplinary historiography on this topic, see also Haller, *Die Suche nach dem Fremden*, 22.

The volume *Populus Revisus* (1966),[251] for instance, captures this diversity by recording the proceedings of an intimate conference organized by and held at the Tübingen institute. Among those presenters invited to participate are many who would be remembered as leading voices in the field's critical historiography, but also representatives of the established professoriate—Walter Hävernick and Herbert Freudenthal from the University of Hamburg, for example—who acknowledged that postwar *Volkskunde* faced challenges, but were resistant to address them through substantial reform. It should be noted also that the Tübingen Institute, though remembered as a hotbed of reform in the 1960s, was still a source of more conservative historiographic discourse directed at the institute's long, proud history beginning as early as the mid-1700s. Sources like the 1964 *Festschrift* for Helmut Dölker reveal that despite Bausinger's sweeping reforms and the addition of numerous young, activist faculty members, it was still an institute in transition.[252]

But there was also a middle ground between the extremes. *Deutsche Volkskunde zwischen Germanistik und Sozialwissenschaft* (1969), published by conference attendee Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann (1918–1993), exemplifies an approach to *Volkskunde*'s history that mediates between conservative avoidance and reformist scrutinizing. At first blush the work seems to be a simple continuation of earlier postwar *Volkskunde* historiography, surveying the field from the *Vorläufer* (forerunners) Herodotus and Tacitus, through Romanticism, Riehl's scientific vision, up to Weiss's Swiss ersatz. But there are two tendencies that set Weber-Kellermann's overview of the field apart from both the conservative and reformist historiographies of the early postwar period.

---

[251] Bausinger, *Populus revisus*.

[252] Hermann Bausinger, ed., *Zur Geschichte von Volkskunde und Mundartforschung in Württemberg: Helmut Dölker zum 60. Geburtstag* (Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1964).

First, Weber-Kellermann's treatment of popular Nazi-era theory diverges from that of the conservative *Volkskundler* who bridged the wartime and postwar generations[253] in that she frames the work of Naumann, Lauffer, and others within patterns of ongoing intradisciplinary critique. In discussing how such theory was misapplied, misguided, or misunderstood, Weber-Kellermann's project is not to protect the field from itself by disassociating from, or making vague excuses about historical circumstances, but rather to adopt a broader view that admits a level of self-reflexivity already in the field. Yet Weber-Kellermann also places distance between herself and the radical reformers in her coverage of developments in postwar *Volkskunde*, for instance by questioning the premises of political-ideological critiques forwarded between Maus and Bausinger.[254]

Second, in contrast to the few early postwar discussions concerning disciplinary reform (Maus, Moser) and contemporaneous debates (to be covered shortly), Weber-Kellermann emphasizes *Volkskunde*'s historical gains across disciplinary boundaries—not just *Germanistik*, but also comparative linguistics (*vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*), ancient history (*Altertumskunde*, including classical studies and archaeology) and ethnopsychology (*Ethnopsychologie*)—without suggesting that the field must strengthen ties with one or another to remain viable. Rather, the point of her survey is to show that *Volkskunde* is strong enough to stand on its own; if any disciplinary boundary should be problematic, then it is the one with other national folklore traditions.[255]

---

[253] This includes the historiographies by Peuckert, Meier, and Lutz, but also others not discussed in detail in the previous chapter, such as the third edition of Adolf Bach's *Deutsche Volkskunde: Wege und Organisation, Probleme, System, Methoden, Ergebnisse und Aufgaben, Schrifttum* (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1960). A similar example is Erich and Beitl, *Wörterbuch der deutschen Volkskunde*.

[254] Weber-Kellermann, *Deutsche Volkskunde zwischen Germanistik und Sozialwissenschaften*, 76–97.

[255] Ibid., 85.

Not surprisingly, then, Weber-Kellermann's introduction to the field would be criticized from both poles of the disciplinary reform spectrum. On the one hand, reform-minded *Volkskundler* saw her as making the same distancing move as earlier, conservative postwar historiographies.[256] On the other hand, more conservative factions saw her as a over-politicizing the field's history.[257] Even so, Weber-Kellermann's history of the field would prove popular enough to appear in two further revised editions (1985 and 2003) in cooperation with colleagues at the University of Marburg.[258] But while it remains a standard reference for *Volkskunde* students, it did not garner as prominent a place in institutional memory as the historiographic critiques of the Tübingen School.

Another example of a *Volkskundler* seeking a middle ground in the historiographic critique of *Volkskunde* was Wolfgang Brückner (b. 1930), chair of *Volkskunde* at the University of Frankfurt am Main and later at the University of Würzburg. But while Brückner would begin his involvements in the discipline's reform as a mediator between the old guard and the vanguard, his negative political feelings toward the radical left would gradually sever him from the ascending leadership of the field. How Brückner came to occupy a marginal position in institutional memory is best understood in the context of two major discursive performances of the ideological battle for *Volkskunde*'s identity and future purpose: professional conferences now referred to iconically as "Detmold" (1969) and "Falkenstein" (1970).

---

256 See for instance, Ina-Maria Greverus, *Kultur und Alltagswelt: Eine Einführung in Fragen der Kulturanthropologie* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1978), 158.

257 See, for instance, the criticism of her treatment of Riehl in Günter Wiegelmann, Matthias Zender, and Gerhard Heilfurth, *Volkskunde: Eine Einführung* (Berlin: E. Zender, 1977), 18.

258 It is notable that the title of the volume changed from the first edition to the second, indicating the new direction the field would take after the 1960s rupture. Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, *Deutsche Volkskunde zwischen Germanistik und Sozialwissenschaften*, Sammlung Metzler 79 (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1969); Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, *Einführung in die Volkskunde, Europäische Ethnologie: Eine Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, 2. erweiterte und ergänzte Auflage, Sammlung Metzler 79 (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1985); Weber-Kellermann, Bimmer, and Becker, *Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie*.

FROM *VOLKSKUNDE* TO THE "*VIELNAMENFACH*"[259]

The antagonistic debates at the 1969 Deutschen Volkskundekongreß in Detmold are captured in issues 66/67 of the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* (1970), which documents the main arguments of the conference in a special section entitled "Vom Nutzen und Nachteile der Volkskunde." Edited by Matthias Zender (1907–1993)[260] and Hermann Bausinger, the journal's recording of the event begins with Marburg *Volkskundler* and president of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde Dieter Kramer's talk, "Wem nützt Volkskunde?,"[261] whose title bespeaks the perennial concern with *Volkskunde*'s *Aufgabe* in society, and with that its latent, troubled relationship to political power. Closely networked with the Tübingen School, Kramer largely follows Bausinger's rhetorical moves in the 1965 *Volksideologie* article: He first outlines the political ideology historically characterizing the field, beginning with Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl,[262] and then proposes a new vision of *Volkskunde*'s role in society as a now reflexively political, critical social science aimed at humanity's emancipation from totalitarianism and aligned explicitly with neo-Marxian Frankfurt School sociology. Within this argument, he focuses not simply on *Volkskunde*'s ideological co-option under Nazism, but indicates

---

259 This section title is inspired by Regina Bendix's 2012 article, "From 'Volkskunde' to the 'Field of Many Names.'"

260 Recall that Zender was one of the coeditors of the conservative-leaning introductions to the field: Wiegelmann, Zender, and Heilfurth, *Volkskunde*. Also in his synopsis of *Volkskunde* in the Federal Republic for the inaugural issues of *Ethnologia Europaea*, Zender emphasizes the field's historical connection to *Germanistik* and other humanities disciplines, regarding sociology and *Völkerkunde / Anthropologie* as aides to *Volkskundler*, but ultimately a controversial interdisciplinary problem. Matthias Zender, "Volkskunde an den Universitäten der Bundesrepublik Deutschland," *Ethnologia Europaea* 1 (1967): 251–53.

261 "To whom is *Volkskunde* useful?"

262 With respect to Kramer's positioning of Riehl in disciplinary history, it is notable that, in contrast to earlier invocations of that figure—such as Maus's interpretation as a failed progressive, socially critical force for the field—Kramer sets him squarely as a conservative ideological force, and implies that Riehls' conception of *Volkskunde* as a "'Polizeiwissenschaft' des Obrigkeitsstaates" ("'police-science' of the government") draws a straight line to National Socialist *Volkskunde*. Dieter Kramer, "Wem nützt Volkskunde?," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 66, no. 1/2 (1970): 2.

toward an ongoing problem of ideology in the field that must be addressed: the retreat to self-deluding positivism and the flight from any critical engagement with current social problems as the solutions to political ideologization.

Kramer's overt and unapologetic leftist political leaning would prove to be the flashpoint of the ultimately fruitless debate reprised in the journal. Echoed across the reactions is Peuckert's initial response to Heinz Maus, in which he accuses the sociologist of engaging in the same ideologization of *Volkskunde* as the Nazis did—simply trading National Socialist ideology for communist ideology.[263] Moreover, the more conservative *Volkskundler* in attendance, though not outright rejecting the sociological reorientation proposed by the younger, left-leaning attendees'[264] call for a sociological turn, still countered it by emphasizing the field's roots in *Germanistik*, history, and the humanities in general. While it is true that *Volkskunde* is a social science, they admitted, it is not *only* a social science. Their implication was that an emphasis on *culture*—which includes the semantic field surrounding the concept of *Volk*, though certainly requiring critical reflection as a necessary part of the field's renewal—should not be abandoned.[265]

In their equating the historically "brown" with the contemporary "red," so to speak, these discursive performances can be read as reflecting a West German Cold War consciousness that mitigated past guilt via alignment with the West and against the increasingly oppressive communist East. The conservative sentiments also may be understood within the context of the increasing volume and radicality of the left protest

[263] Wolfgang Brückner, who would explicitly speak of "trading brown for red" at the subsequent conference at Falkenstein, at this point eschews the color metaphor. No less accusatory, however, is his description of the leftists' vision for *Volkskunde* as simply another rendition of "gläubige Wissenschaft." Günter Wiegelmann et al., "Vom Nutzen und Nachteile der Volkskunde. Diskussion," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 66, no. 1/2 (1970): 56.

[264] Among the younger, more progressive attendees were Karl-S. Kramer of the Munich School, Konrad Köstlin, then at Kiel but strongly networked with the Tübingen School, and, of course, Hermann Bausinger.

[265] See, for instance, Richard Wolfram in Wiegelmann et al., "Vom Nutzen und Nachteile der Volkskunde. Diskussion," 30.

movement in public discourse. Benno Ohnesorg was shot dead by police in 1967 during a political protest rally in West Berlin—his death soon elevated to the status of martyrdom in the fight between the Western conservative establishment and so-called Third Way "socialism with a human face."[266] Political activist and Marxist sociologist Rudi Dutschke was shot a year later, and by 1970, the left-radical domestic terrorist group, the Rote Armee Fraktion, had formed under the leadership of Andreas Baader. The tone of national self-criticism was being pressured to shift from Picard's self-reflective 1946 "Hitler in uns selbst"[267] and Ulrike Meinhof's accusatory 1961 "Hitler in euch."[268] In light of the social upheaval occurring in West Germany in the 1960s, and across the globe, then, one can imagine that for the traditional *Volkskundler* who bridged the wartime and postwar generations, the prospect of engaging contemporary German society would have seemed an especially daunting task.

Ultimately, while demonstrating some willingness to entertain a model of *Volkskunde* directed more toward contemporary society, the conservative majority at Detmold argued that it was possible and indeed necessary to erect a fully depoliticized, even "pure" scientific *Volkskunde*—a radical critique of ideology and radical shift to leftist social criticism was unnecessary, even a passing fashion.[269] Still, in the journal

---

[266] The phrase "socialism with a human face" is frequently attributed to 1960s Czech activist Alexander Dubček, however, the concept was highly influential for members of the West German anti-authoritarian movement. See Brown, *West Germany and the Global Sixties*, 36–37; 106.

[267] "Hitler in Our Selves." Picard, *Hitler in uns selbst*.

[268] "Hitler in You (pl.)" Reprinted in English translation in Ulrike Marie Meinhof, *Everybody Talks about the Weather—We Don't: The Writings of Ulrike Meinhof*, ed. Karin Bauer (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2008).

[269] Walter Hävernick in Wiegelmann et al., "Vom Nutzen und Nachteile der Volkskunde. Diskussion," 26. As Hermann Bausinger would later remember it: "So wird auf dem Deutschen Volkskundekongreß 1969 in Detmold intensive und kontrovers darüber diskutiert, auf welchem gesellschaftspolitischen wie theoretischen Vorstellungen das Fach künftig aufbauen soll und ob der belastete Name 'Volkskunde'—wie überhaupt der Begriff 'Volk'—noch verwendungsfähig sei. Einer Mehrheit der Anwesenden gehen diese Vorschläge zu einer grundlegenden Fachrevision freilich (noch) zu weit." Bausinger, *Ein Aufklärer des Alltags*, 92.

record at least, the leftist camp has the last word:[270] In his closing remarks about the Detmold conference, Hermann Bausinger echoes the radical left's message to German politicians and society: *Volkskundler* should continue a self-critical conversation at future meetings and not sweep the issues aside in the pursuit of business as usual (the perceived "eigentliche Arbeit" [actual work] of *Volkskunde*).[271] For, the reformers believed, the desire for *Verwissenschaftlichung* threatened to efface the fact that *Volkskunde* was continuing to work in the service of the state, documenting Germanic culture for public appreciation. The *Belastung* of the Nazi period had not been overcome, and the solution to this serious problem was not to be found through avoiding the question of politicization by invoking positivism, but rather by making historical reflexivity a permanent practice of the discipline.

Striking a relatively conciliatory chord in his summary of the conference, Frankfurt *Volkskundler* Wolfgang Brückner—not a senior faculty member but rather a contemporary of Bausinger—proposed the need and parameters for a follow-up meeting to more fruitfully address the still unresolved problem of a disunified disciplinary identity without a common core of key concepts and shared conception of *Volkskunde*'s scientific object and social significance. Among his proposals was the need for a handbook that describes *Volkskunde*'s central ideas and issues—the field's "*Selbstdarstellung*" (self-

[270] The journal was coedited by Hermann Bausinger and Matthias Zender, a more traditional *Volkskundler* based at the University of Bonn who also worked on the *Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde* after 1945.

[271] Bausinger in Wiegelmann et al., "Vom Nutzen und Nachteile der Volkskunde. Diskussion," 59. In fact, Dieter Kramer continues the critical conversation in a published response to the responses to his Detmold talk. Gerhard Lutz and Utz Jeggle also add to the debate in the same journal issue, with Lutz casting it as a "leidiges Thema" (vexed issue) while Jeggle casts it as "offenes Thema" (open issue). Dieter Kramer, "Probleme der gesellschaftlichen und beruflichen Praxis in der Kultursoziologie und europäische Ethnologie. Zur Diskussion um 'Wem nützt Volkskunde?,'" *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 67, no. 2 (1971): 228–43; Gerhard Lutz, "Rückfall oder Methode? Bemerkungen zu einem leidigen Thema," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 67, no. 2 (1971): 244–47; Utz Jeggle, "Weitere Bemerkungen zu einem offenen Thema," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 67, no. 2 (1971): 247ff.

representation)—to be the basis for a subsequent meeting.[272] But although Brückner offered to address this need himself, the Tübingen *Volkskundler* more quickly published a volume written partly in reaction to the Detmold debate; their *Abschied vom Volksleben* (1970) would become the impulse for that proposed follow-up discussion.

The essays in that collection of recent institute conference talks[273] were the stuff of classic paradigm shift rolled into one programmatic volume. As Utz Jeggle explains in the foreword, the authors collectively advocate a discipline-wide departure from "false theoretical conditionings of research, . . . from certain lines of disciplinary tradition that could now only be of ideological-critical interest."[274] The term "Volksleben" in this usage, then, stands for all unreflected categories through which *Volkskunde* makes its object, but which in fact have no basis in lived reality. But the collection is not simply another iteration of the Folklorismus-Debatte set up by Moser in the 1950s; it is a call for a complete reenvisioning of *Volkskunde* as a historically reflexive, socially critical, sociologically oriented, empirical science.

Like Kramer's Detmold talk, the book expands upon Bausinger's basic premises of disciplinary critique: the fundamental problem of political ideologization, how this continues to inhere in *Volkskunde*'s terminology and research, and proposals for a future direction based on sociological theory and rigorous empirical methods. While disciplinary historiography is discussed across the volume's essays, it is mainly invoked to support the call for a new direction and identity for the field. For example, the critique

---

[272] Brückner in Wiegelmann et al., "Vom Nutzen und Nachteile der Volkskunde. Diskussion," 56.

[273] The essays collected in *Abschied vom Volksleben*, as Klaus Geiger, Utz Jeggle, and Gottfried Korff explain in the volume's foreword, in fact predate the Detmold meeting by several months, having first been presented at a conference in Tübingen in April 1969. The debate at Demold was then a provocation to revise and publish the essays.

[274] "falschen theoretischen Konditionierungen der Forschungsarbeit, . . . vom einzelnen Traditionssträngen dieser Wissenschaft, die nur noch von ideologie-kritischem Interesse sein können" Korff, Jeggle, and Geiger, *Abschied vom Volksleben*, 8.

of the existing canon is offered as evidence that *Volkskunde* has no theoretical grounding of its own, and so must find it in other disciplines.

Abschied vom Volksleben has been inscribed in institutional memory as a paradigm-shifting programmatic statement for the field.[275] But the first thorough investigation of *Volkskunde*'s work in the Nazi period would be undertaken instead by Bausinger's graduate student, Wolfgang Emmerich. In his 1968 doctoral thesis, *Germanistische Volkstumsideologie: Genese und Kritik der Volksforschung im Dritten Reich*, and in its revised version, *Zur Kritik der Volkstumsideologie* (1971), Emmerich presents an unprecedented analysis of the details of National Socialist *Volkskunde*, unpacking the specific features of politicized *Volk* ideology and enumerating the activities of Nazi collaborators with an unabashedness perhaps untenable even for the most left-leaning professoriate.

While ruminations and debates about *Volkskunde*'s fraught past and possible future direction began to proliferate across university institutes in the 1960s, the collaborative *Abschied* and monographic *Volkstumsideologie* quickly became the twin impulses for a true intradisciplinary debate as they offered explicit answers to the two central questions of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*: What happened, and what should we do now? The books attained this status in no small part by providing the impulse for the papers and working group discussions at the 1970 meeting of the student branch of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde in the town of Falkenstein outside Frankfurt am Main. There, the rigorous, critical stock-taking of *Volkskunde*'s object(s) of inquiry, methods, theory, and social relevance—its *Selbstbestimmung* and *Erkenntnisziele*—that

[275] Rolf Lindner builds upon the transition of perspective represented by 1970 *Abschied* when he describes a "zweiter Abschied vom Volksleben" (second departure from folklife) in the more recent conceptual shift from research on "Arbeiterkultur" (worker's culture) to research on "Arbeitskulturen" (cultures of work). Rolf Lindner, "Der zweite Abschied vom Volksleben," *Volkskultur und Moderne*, 2000, 149–55.

the left-leaning young *Volkskundler* so adamantly advocated would finally come to fruition.

Referred to iconically as "Falkenstein" in subsequent historiography, the five-day conference became the central metaphor for *Volkskunde*'s 1960s epistemological and institutional reformation.[276] Though debates about the significance of and appropriate response to the field's politicized past from Riehl to National Socialism were ongoing in various forms since 1946, those earlier historiographic narratives set up arguments for the field's stability, and so had little effect on disciplinary structures. The Falkenstein meeting and the *Falkensteiner Protokolle* (1971)[277] that records it meanwhile encapsulate the full breadth of the positions and proposals concerning the history and fate of *Volkskunde* in West Germany that had emerged by that point in time. While it was not the first or only instigating factor in the field's structural upheaval, it is the event best remembered as marking the *Volkskunde*'s ideological, theoretical, and methodological splintering that formed the foundation of the field's current disciplinary structuration.

Brückner's *Protokolle* documents the entire process: from the initial open letters proposing the meeting and introducing the topics for discussion, to the conference papers themselves, transcripts of responses and work group discussions, journal reports on the events, and the resulting manifesto, the so-called "Falkenstein Resolution." As Brückner emphasized in the invitation letter to university departments and scholarly societies, it was not so important exactly who or how many came to the meeting, as who was ready to actively collaborate to find solutions to the discipline's identity crisis.[278] Conflicts that until then had been either explosive or veiled (*verschleiert*) were to be discussed in an

[276] Bendix, "From 'Volkskunde' to the 'Field of Many Names,'" 373–374.
[277] Wolfgang Brückner, *Falkensteiner Protokolle* (Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Volkskunde, 1971).
[278] Ibid., 25.

open, constructive forum. In contrast to the strongly intergenerational debate at Detmold, however, senior faculty members mostly declined the invitation to participate. Ultimately, the conference was attended by only seven professors, twenty-five PhD- and Magister-holders working in other research and teaching positions, and fourteen university students and other observers.

The politics of science was the central theme of Falkenstein, where everything from *Fachbegriffe* (specialized terminology) to disciplinary history, international collaborations, and institute names was debated in speaker forums and working groups, and in more collegial tones than at Detmold. All Falkenstein attendees agreed that the field's essence was the ethnological study of culture. Still, *Volkskunde*'s relation to other sciences, especially history, *Germanistik*, and sociology, remained a point of cleavage among different parties. Emblematic of the diverse solutions proposed for dealing with the field's identity crisis and plan for a way forward was the debate—and concluding decision—about what the discipline ought to be called.[279] There was little question among the participants that the word *Volkskunde* continued to bear a taint of perverted nationalist politicization. The Tübingen School bid farewell to *Volkskunde* when it removed the word from its institute name and adopted the new title, Institut für Empirische Kulturwissenschaft (institute for empirical cultural science), in 1971. However, Tübingen's new moniker was not the only alternative in circulation.

---

[279] That the renaming debate was an expression of a broader crisis of disciplinary identity has been observed time and again in the field's historiography. See, for instance, Greverus, *Kultur und Alltagswelt*, 158; Helge Gerndt, "Zur Perspektive volkskundlicher Forschung," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 76 (1980): 23; Gottfried Korff, "Namenwechsel als Paradigmenwechsel? Die Umbenennung des Faches Volkskunde an deutschen Universitäten als Versuch einer 'Entnationalisierung,'" in *Fünfzig Jahre danach: Zur Nachgeschichte des Nationalsozialismus*, ed. Sigrid Weigel and Birgit R. Erdle (Zürich: VDF, 1996), 379–402; Regina F. Bendix and Tatjana Eggeling, eds., *Namen und was sie bedeuten: Zur Namensdebatte im Fach Volkskunde* (Göttingen: Schmerse, 2004); Zimmermann, *Empirische Kulturwissenschaft, Europäische Ethnologie, Kulturanthropologie, Volkskunde*.

A second major renaming proposal discussed at Falkenstein was *Kulturanthropologie*, the primary advocate for which was Ina-Maria Greverus. Greverus assumed the chair of the *Volkskunde* institute at the University of Frankfurt am Main in 1974, replacing Wolfgang Brückner, who then took up the chair at Würzburg. Less radical than those who proposed to deal with the field's troubled history in the Nazi period by discarding the native canon, she argued for a theoretical reorientation that kept *Volkskunde* grounded as a German tradition while also connecting it with the European and US-American anthropological communities.

Like Bausinger, Greverus was trained in *Germanistik* and *Volkskunde*, and her early research combined the two via a narrative model of cultural analysis. However, their theoretical approaches diverged significantly: where the Tübingen School saw an overtly political sociological turn as the future of German *Volkskunde*, Greverus's model was a combination of the German traditions of Husserl's phenomenological "Lebenswelt" (life world) and philosophical anthropology and US-American cultural anthropology.[280] Thus, *Kulturanthropologie* was not simply a translation of the English term, but a novel hybrid of American and German anthropological traditions focused on the "Alltagswelt" (everyday world)—culture as a matter of everyday life.

Greverus's interest in theorizing universal human phenomena like terroritoriality, memory, identity, and intercultural contact (including the ethnographic fieldwork encounter) in regional and European contexts (as opposed to national notions of culture)[281] was criticized at first for too closely aligning with neighboring *Völkerkunde*

[280] See especially her exposition on German and non-German theories of *Volk* and *Kultur* in Greverus, *Kultur und Alltagswelt*, 157–218. Greverus discusses how she came to know and appreciate American cultural anthropology in her interview volume Groffmann et al., *Kulturanthropologinnen im Dialog*.

[281] See, for instance, Ina-Maria Greverus, *Auf der Suche nach Heimat* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1979); Ina-Maria Greverus, *Der territoriale Mensch: Ein literaturanthropologischer Versuch zum Heimatphänomen* (Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1972).

and for too closely following a biologistic cultural model—which, by then it went without saying, could contain potential for dangerous nationalist or racist misapplications. However, Greverus successfully defended her stance across a number of articles and monographs in the 1970s and 80s.[282] In consequence, *Kulturanthropologie* began to take root as one of the main bureaucratic disciplinary designations for West German university institutes replacing the title of *Volkskunde*.[283] Meanwhile Tübingen's *Empirische Kulturwissenschaft* would remain a terminological outlier in the field denoting a very particular institutional history and regional, sociological research perspective. Upon assuming the chair, Greverus gave the *Volkskunde* institute at the University of Frankfurt a name that reflected her vision: the Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie.

Greverus's institutional renaming also includes a second titular option proposed at Falkenstein—one that sought to connect the field in West Germany with the international scholarly community: *Europäische Ethnologie* (European Ethnology). Discussion of whether to adopt this name as *Volkskunde*'s new disciplinary identity in fact began in the 1950s, as German scientists from all fields were beginning to reconnect with their European counterparts on both sides of the emerging Cold War divide. The model emerged out of the well-established Scandinavian tradition, and especially the work of

---

[282] For a full exposition of the significance of *Kulturanthropologie* as a way forward for Germany's *Volkskunde*, see the discussion in the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*: Gerhard Lutz, "Volkskunde und Kulturanthropologie: Zur Frage der Ortsbestimmung unseres Faches," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 67, no. 1 (1971): 1–12; Ina Maria Greverus, "Kulturanthropologie und Kulturethologie: 'Wende zur Lebenswelt' und 'Wende zur Natur,'" *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 67, no. 1 (1971): 13–25; Utz Jeggle, "Beharrung oder Wandel? Fragen an eine kulturanthropologisch ausgerichtete Ethnologie," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 67, no. 1 (1971): 26–37.

[283] On Greverus's plan for translating *Kulturanthropologie* into a university curriculum plan, see Ina-Maria Greverus, "Zu einem Curriculum für das Fachgebiet Kulturanthropologie," *Ethnologia Europaea* 5 (1971): 214–24.

Sigurd Erixon.[284] But although *Kulturanthropologie* received the most votes at the end of the Falkenstein conference, between the two terms, *Europäische Ethnologie* would ultimately have the more far-reaching institutional adoption, as a subsequent survey of the field in the German-speaking sphere revealed that most professionals preferred the latter.[285]

The Falkenstein conference revealed that there was an overall consensus that the field must be renamed to represent its new, postfascist identity. However, by the end the attendees could not reach a consensus on what that identity and name should be. The representatives at Falkenstein remained split between those who advocated the discipline's (re)establishment as a critical social science, looking to the Frankfurt School, as well as American and Scandinavian cultural anthropology for new concepts and connections; and those who preferred a positivist orientation that proposed to navigate the fraught terrain of state investment in scholarship through rigorous empiricism at the expense of theory, which could be construed as another kind of ideology.

Senior faculty members who did not attend responded defensively to the summary of the conference—the "Falkenstein Resolution"—that was distributed afterward to all West German *Volkskunde* institutes. The conservative position is summarized well by director of the Hamburg *Volkskunde* institute, Walter Hävernick, who states: "What a science achieves in the course of time and in the present does not depend on its name but rather on the people who contribute to the overarching theme in the form of research

---

[284] See Sigurd Erixon, "Regional European Ethnology," *Folk-Liv*, 1937, 89–108; Sigurd Emanuel Erixon, *European Ethnology as a Social Science* (Arnheim, 1955); Erixon, *Erixoniana*. See also Sigfrid Svensson, *Einführung in die europäische Ethnologie* (Meisenheim am Glan: A. Hain, 1973); Bjarne Stoklund and Bengt Holbek, *Europäische Ethnologie* (Würzburg: Bayerische Blätter für Volkskunde, 1981).

[285] *dgv-Informationen* 80, no. 1 (1971), cited in Wiegelmann, Zender, and Heilfurth, *Volkskunde*, 9. The controversy surrounding the concept of European ethnology / *Europäische Ethnologie* will be taken up in Part III of the present work.

studies and representations."[286] The name *Volkskunde* is one hundred fifty years old; while there had been "*Irrtümer*" (errors), Hävernick concluded, this is no reason to discard the name which symbolizes a long tradition. A way forward could be achieved, Hävernick and his peers believed, without introducing a new disciplinary lexicon or rethinking recent past ideological investments of supposed positivist science (e.g., the Nazi collection of data on peoples they tried to eradicate, for the historical record).

While contemporary historiography posits "Falkenstein" as an important event that initiated a tradition of self-reflexive working meetings,[287] because little concordance was found on a host of theoretical, methodological, and political-ideological issues there, the "Falkenstein Resolution" was essentially an agreement to disagree. As a consequence, *Volkskunde* began to splinter into several different orientations with associated institutional networks indicated by the variety of new institute names. Several institutes retained the name *Volkskunde* in some form,[288] and the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde and its journal the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* retain the term to this day, as well.[289]

What on the surface appeared to be an intergenerational conflict regarding the discipline's past and present relationship to state power and ideology, thought to be easily

---

[286] "Was eine Wissenschaft im Laufe der Zeit und in der Gegenwart leistet, hängt nicht vom Namen ab sondern von den Menschen selbst, die in Form von Untersuchungen und Darstellungen etwas zum Gesamtthema beitragen." Brückner, *Falkensteiner Protokolle*, 306.

[287] Bendix, "From 'Volkskunde' to the 'Field of Many Names,'" 373–374.

[288] Among the German institutes still retaining the term *Volkskunde* in their name today are Munich, Augsburg, Würzburg, Bonn, Mainz, Hamburg, Kiel, Rostock, and Freiburg. Of these, only Rostock's and Freiburg's institutes are called simply the Institut für Volkskunde. The rest are typically coupled either with *Europäische Ethnologie* or *Kulturanthropologie*.

[289] Another dissenting senior faculty member, Günter Wiegelmann, cowrote an introduction to the field in 1977 that acknowledges the now dispersed disciplinary identity, and then attempts to shore it up, first by restricting his description to the traditional methods, research objects, and goals of German *Volkskunde* represented at the authors' institution (Münster, Bonn, and Marburg), and second by casting Nazi-era *Volkskunde* as a matter of outside, political co-option that is now past. See Wiegelmann, Zender, and Heilfurth, *Volkskunde*, especially 31–38.

solvable with new terminology and/or rigorous empiricism, proved to be a much deeper fissure that would deepen in the next generation, as we shall see in the next chapter. The identity crisis laid bare at Falkenstein, reified in institute titles, would also manifest in divergent curricula; in closed networks of scholarly collaboration; in professional societies and publications in terms of the topical directions adopted by editors and organizers; and in the research orientations and self-profiling of the succeeding generation of professors who inherited each branch of the split.

The field's titular dispersal could be read as a highly symbolic, as well as highly public, sign of failure. But while the hoped-for agreement about the future existence and identity of *Volkskunde* in West German academe did not materialize from the heated debates at Falkenstein, confronting the problem of the discipline's past did yield a more definite, albeit splintered, articulation of the work and significance of the discipline. As my interviews bore out, "Falkenstein" today holds a somewhat ambiguous place in institutional memory. While many interviewees insisted the meeting was a watershed moment in disciplinary history, they also admitted that rarely anyone reads the actual *Protokolle* today besides those who, like me, are interested in how the field came to its present state. In that sense, Falkenstein might most accurately be described as a site, but not necessarily a source, of institutional memory. More often, students read standard introductory texts like Weber-Kellermann's editions, and especially the works of the Tübingen reformers and their students now holding the professorships that guide the field.[290]

[290] My interviews and participant-observation at *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* institutes in 2010–2011 revealed, for instance, that *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie* (1999, reprinted 2006) by Wolfgang Kaschuba, a student of Bausinger chair of the Institut für Europäische Ethnologie at the Humboldt University of Berlin, is standard reading for current students in the field.

While "Falkenstein" often serves as shorthand for the field's most important postwar paradigm shift, it also indexes the critical and reflexive processes already underway in the 1960s—in the conferences, discussions, seminars, and publications of certain attendees, and most often those produced at the Tübingen School. In 1960 Tübingen already had closed shop and reopened under new management, so to speak, solidifying its new identity with the 1971 substitution of "Empirische Kulturwissenschaft" for "Volkskunde" in its title. From then on, the institute would base its identity on having been a site of revolutionary reform through the faculty's rigorous, direct engagement with *Volkskunde*'s Nazi entanglements.[291] But Tübingen's prominent place in institutional memory bears out in the enduring popularity of the introductions to the field it published in the 1970s, as well. Hermann Bausinger's *Volkskunde: Von der Altertumsforschung zur Kulturanalyse*, first published in 1971,[292] was reprinted three times in German, in original and edited versions, most recently in 1999, and translated into four other languages (though, notably, not English), most recently Japanese in 2010. The work is a remarkable hybrid of disciplinary critique and thorough overview of the full breadth of the field in all its variety. The edited volume, *Grundzüge der Volkskunde*,[293] is organized around the key concepts of the field—*Kultur*, *Alltag*, *Geschichtlichkeit*, and *Identität*. First published in 1978 and reprinted in 1989, 1993, and

[291] During my 2011 fieldwork visit to the institute, still housed in its original building, I found it striking how the entryway was decorated with artefacts from the Nazi era—among them the now crumbling stone sign bearing the institute's original name, a reconstructed, ornately carved wooden bench originally installed in the Nazi period, as well as a rather large banner with a narrative of the institute's history. These items, as the banner explains, were an expression of the spirit of Nazi *Volk* ideology, a "manipulative NS-Ästhetik" of origin myths and traditional German folk culture. The banner further reminds readers that *Volkskunde*'s task under Nazism was, according to the institute's first chair, Gustav Bebermeyer, the "Sichtbarmachen und die Erkenntnis der Arteigenheit des deutschen Wesens und Sag- und Sachgut."

[292] Hermann Bausinger, *Volkskunde: Von der Altertumsforschung zur Kulturanalyse* (Darmstadt: Carl Habel, 1971).

[293] Hermann Bausinger et al., *Grundzüge der Volkskunde* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978).

1999, the ideas captured in the work continue to unify the field around these *Grundbegriffe*. Thus, although "Falkenstein" is an iconic marker of the field's postwar refashioning of its structural and narrated identity, it would be the Tübingen circle on the issue of *Volkskunde* under National Socialism that would become enshrined in institutional memory as milestone historiographic and programmatic references.

But between Tübingen's influential reframing and those leaders of an earlier generation who still believed that *Volkskunde* was redeemable on its own merits—if not its theories, then its methodology—numerous other institutes were making the shift to a new identity that recognized the field's lack of fresh, internationally current cultural theory, but without such explicit historiographic self-criticism vis-à-vis National Socialism.[294] Furthermore, while institute renaming has happened almost across the entire field, it did not occur all at once in the wake of Falkenstein. Instead, the refashioning of institute identities—and the discipline's identity in aggregate—has rolled out gradually and continuously over the succeeding decades up to the present, instigated by changes in

[294] A prime example of this is Ina-Maria Greverus's Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie at the University of Frankfurt am Main. Sources on the history of the institute and Greverus's unique vision for its research orientation include Greverus, *Kultur und Alltagswelt*; Groffmann et al., *Kulturanthropologinnen im Dialog*; Helma Lutz et al., "Ina-Maria Greverus: Aufbruch in die Kulturanthropologie," in *Einzeln und Gemeinsam 100 Jahre starke Frauen an der Goethe-Universität* (Frankfurt am Main: Gleichstellungsbüro Goethe Universität, 2014), 46–47. Another example is Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann's leadership at the Marburg institute, which retained in part a traditional *Volkskunde* orientation through ongoing folk culture documentation project and traced proudly back to Wilhelm-Heinrich Riehl. Yet the institute also produced innovative comparative work, captured in the series *Marburger Studienkreis für Europäische Ethnologie* and *Marburger Studien zur vergleichenden Ethnosoziologie*. Weber-Kellermann herself engaged in new theoretical work on universal and intercultural issues, via such concepts as the "*Interethnik*." Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, *Zur Interethnik: Donauschwaben, Siebenbürger Sachsen und ihre Nachbarn* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1978). See also Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, Siegfried Becker, and Andreas C. Bimmer, *Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann: Erinnern und Vergessen. Autobiographisches und weitere Materialien* (Marburg: Jonas, 1998); Elsbeth Wallnöfer, *Mass nehmen, Mass halten: Frauen im Fach Volkskunde* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2008).

institute leadership and the accompanying redirections of research orientation and rearrangements of institutional alignments.[295]

Finally, external pressures, such as the establishment of new universities in the 1970s and the broader "cultural turn" that swept across the humanities and social sciences between the 1970s and the 1990s,[296] would yield other new configurations for *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie*.[297] A full genealogy of university institute transformations is beyond the scope of this project. Suffice it here to say that accounting for the origins of the *Vielnamenfach* became a standard performance in histories of the field already in the 1970s.[298] Often this rehearsing of the naming debate served as prelude to a defense of a particular name choice, but in every case it reveals how *Volkskunde*'s "1968" would prove the most prominent postwar turning point in disciplinary historiography from that time forward. As *Volkskundlerin* and disciplinary historian Regina Bendix observes, "The rift within the discipline emanating from those years has not been completely overcome."[299] Instead, the field's reformation would be translated into new, positive founding myth in the field's institutional memory—its historiographic narratives and its epistemic and organizational structures.

---

[295] For the full list of current institute names, see the institutional member list of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde: http://www.d-g-v.org/institutionen/universitaetsinstitute.

[296] The effect of the "cultural turn" on *Volkskunde*'s self-presentation as a "Kulturwissenschaft" will be discussed in detail in Chapters 5 and 8.

[297] The primary example of this is the University of Bremen, a so-called reform university founded in 1971. Its interdisciplinary degree program for "Kulturwissenschaft," established in 1986, will be discussed in greater detail in Part III.

[298] This is especially true of introductory texts. See, for instance, Wiegelmann, Zender, and Heilfurth, *Volkskunde*; Bausinger et al., *Grundzüge der Volkskunde*, 1978; Zimmermann, *Empirische Kulturwissenschaft, Europäische Ethnologie, Kulturanthropologie, Volkskunde*; Rolf Wilhelm Brednich, *Grundriß der Volkskunde: Einführung in die Forschungsfelder der Europäischen Ethnologie* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1988); Göttsch and Lehmann, *Methoden der Volkskunde*; Kaschuba, *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*; Dieter Kramer, *Europäische Ethnologie und Kulturwissenschaften*, ed. Johanna Rolshoven (Marburg: Jonas-Verlag, 2013). On the problem and meaning of the *Vielnamenfach* itself, see Korff, "Namenwechsel als Paradigmenwechsel?"; Bendix and Eggeling, *Namen und was sie bedeuten*; Bendix, "From 'Volkskunde' to the 'Field of Many Names.'"

[299] Bendix, "From 'Volkskunde' to the 'Field of Many Names,'" 373.

SUMMARY

In *Volkskunde*'s upheaval in the 1960s/70s, the goading discourses strongly mirrored the major political discourse of the period concerning Germany's troubled past and the specter of National Socialism in the present—both in the youth's accusations about the parent generation's lingering fascism, and in the anticommunist discourse that set Nazism and Soviet Communism on the same plane of totalitarianism. But while Tony Judt has argued that the 1960s antiauthoritarian movements were politically ineffectual and culturally only a brief, albeit bright, flashpoint in their time, the stories told by *Volkskunde*'s radical reformers—about their discipline's past, its future, and their guiding role in its transformation—have left an enduring impression in the field's institutional memory, as the next chapter will elucidate. This phenomenon resonates with historian Timothy Scott Brown's argument about West Germany's "1968" in general: that the historiography has been dominated by the so-called "68ers" themselves.[300] In the dynamic of institutional memory, the reformers' stories, though not permeating the field completely, provoked a structural splintering that is the hallmark of the "*Vielnamenfach*" still today.

The translation of *Volkskunde*'s "1968" into institutional memory also necessarily involved instances of institutional forgetting, both perceived and real. Certain figures like Wolfgang Brückner, who rejected the leftist ideological implications of the most radical reform proposals, would be positioned as standing on the wrong side of history in subsequent historiography, and with that, have a lesser role in determining the future epistemic and organizational structures of the field on a large scale. And, as I witnessed in some of my interviews, perceptions of slighting also persist among some members of

[300] Brown, *West Germany and the Global Sixties*, 5; Bendix, "From 'Volkskunde' to the 'Field of Many Names.'"

that generation, making their actual successes in reforming the field bittersweet in retrospect. This problem of institutional forgetting resonates with what Brown identifies as one of the implications of the reformers' dominance in constructing the memory of "1968" and its effects that he seeks to address with his book: that today a fresh perspective on West Germany's "1968" is now possible and indeed necessary. Taking its cue from Brown's critique, then, the remaining chapters of the dissertation will explore alternative discourses that are being—or might be—recovered in the institutional memory of Germany's *Volkskunde*.

Chapter 3:

From Third-wave *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* to "Normalization," 1980–Present

The first two chapters of Part I outlined the construction of *Volkskunde*'s postwar institutional memory from the initial defensive or sparse critical responses, through the epistemic and institutional rupture that was *Volkskunde*'s "1968." That analysis demonstrated how disciplinary historiography from the first thirty postwar years reflected broader trends in West German public discourse, beginning with the social shock and disbelief of citizenry and political leadership as they began to cope with the aftermath of total war. Soon, however, the country entered a stage of collective amnesia concerning the recent past, abetted by the future-directed discourse of Western geopolitical integration and the Federal Republic's *Wirtschaftswunder* (economic miracle). West Germany's "1968" then forwarded a generational critique of these preliminary postwar discourses. For the field of *Volkskunde*, this broader social revolution would be translated into a major structural transformation of an academic discipline.

This chapter considers how the ruptures associated with *Volkskunde*'s Nazification and the field's ideological / orientational splintering in the 1960s/70s are translated in the organizational and epistemic structures and historiographic tropes that

constitute institutional memory from the 1980s to the present. As Mary Beth Stein observed in 1987 and Regina Bendix reiterated in 2012,[301] intradisciplinary consideration of *Volkskunde* in the Nazi era shifted focus in the 1980s away from an ideological-theoretical critique and toward the details of the "Nazification of an academic discipline" at the institutional level, to borrow the words of James Dow and Hannjost Lixfeld.[302] This intradisciplinary trend again coincided with a new wave of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in German public discourse and German studies scholarship. Just as the trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* was expanding in scope and frequency in public discourse, so too for *Volkskunde* by this time, as Bendix observes, "the topic was no longer owned by the radical Tübingen voices; it has becomes . . . everyone's business."[303]

In the 1980s, as the war generation began passing away and the political current shifted from the SPD's (Socialist Democratic Party) left to the CDU's (Christian Democratic Party) right, West Germany faced new questions of how most appropriately to remember the Nazi period as it played into narratives concerning the country's present and future status as a peaceful, productive nation. These questions would arise again and again into the present, across a range of fields of public discourse, from international relations (such as Helmut Kohl's intonation of the "Gnade der späten Geburt" during a 1984 visit to Israel[304]) to literature (like Günter Grass's 2006 admission of SS-membership), popular entertainment and documentary cinema (including both German-

---

[301] Stein, "Coming to Terms with the Past," 179–180; Bendix, "From 'Volkskunde' to the 'Field of Many Names,'" 374.

[302] Dow and Lixfeld, *The Nazification of an Academic Discipline*.

[303] Bendix, "From 'Volkskunde' to the 'Field of Many Names,'" 374.

[304] The implication of Kohl's infamous phrase—"the mercy of late birth"—is that war guilt had passed with the war generation. Further political incidents include the 1985 "Bitburg Affair" involving Ronald Reagan's visit to a military cemetery and President Richard von Wiezsäcker's 1985 internationally circulated speech recasting May 8, 1945 as the day of Germany's liberation, not its capitulation. Fischer and Lorenz, *Lexikon der "Vergangenheitsbewältigung" in Deutschland*, 226–229; 232–235. For a reprint of the "Wiezsäckerrede," see Eberhard Rathgeb, *Die engagierte Nation: Deutsche Debatten 1945–2005* (Munich: Hanser, 2005), 327–330.

and Hollywood-produced films), and public memorialization (for example, the exhibit [1995–1999 and 2001–2004] documenting Wehrmacht war crimes).[305] Often these discursive shifts sparked heated national and even international debates, as revisionist voices ventured to offer new—or resurrected old—interpretations of German history, both condemnatory and exonerating. Perhaps the most emblematic of the controversial shifts in West German *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* discourse is the so-called "*Historikerstreit*" (historians' dispute) of the mid-1980s, an open debate between two camps of German historians and philosophers about the significance of the Third Reich and the Holocaust in the larger scope of German history.[306]

---

[305] For further examples from the fields of literature, media, and memorials, see the Introduction to Part I of the present work.

[306] Alfred Low outlines the history, parties, stakes, and reverberations of the debate in *The Third Reich and the Holocaust in German Historiography*. The *Historikerstreit* was in fact only the latest iteration of debates that began in the late 1940s and early 50s, most readily associated with the historians Friedrich Meinecke and Gerhard Ritter, about the history of German anti-Semitism and the special status of Nazi crimes against the Jews. In the 1980s, the argument—by then pursued by an interdisciplinary assemblage of historians, philosophers, and sociologists including Hans Mommsen, Jürgen Habermas, Jürgen Kocka, and Martin Broszat—reemerged over the question of whether the Holocaust was a singular event in history with an indissoluble imprint on German national identity, or a political mass killing comparable to others, specifically Stalin's gulags. To Low, it is not surprising that the issue arose forcefully again at that time, not least because of the greater temporal distance from Nazi atrocities. But it was also a time when West Germany was experiencing a forceful pull between its now strong role in the democratic, capitalist West and the reemergence of sometimes extreme nationalist sentiment. Ibid., xii–xiii.

Later public controversies include the Walser-Bubis debate ignited by author Martin Walser's contentious 1998 comment that Germany must move on, lest the memorialization of the Holocaust be reduced to empty ritual. Walser, *Ansprachen aus Anlaß der Verleihung des Friedenspreises*. More recently, criticism of West Germany's early social critics swirled around Günter Grass's belated autobiographical admission that he freely joined the Wehrmacht and eventually the Waffen-SS. Grass, *Beim Häuten der Zwiebel*; Martin Kölbel, *Ein Buch, ein Bekenntnis: Die Debatte um Günter Grass' "Beim Häuten der Zwiebel"* (Göttingen: Steidl, 2007).

Finally, in the international arena, there was the "Goldhagen Debate" surrounding political scientist Daniel Goldhagen's book, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*. Goldhagen's book, which began as his doctoral dissertation, presented the revisionist thesis that eliminatory anti-Semitism that made the Holocaust possible was already part of the collect German psyche in the nineteenth century. The book stirred the ire of scholars and media commentators alike, who objected to the reductionist smearing of Germany's national character. See Christopher R. Browning and Leon Wieseltier, *The "Willing Executioners"—"Ordinary Men" Debate* (Washington, D.C.: United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 1996); Robert R. Shandley, *Unwilling Germans?: The Goldhagen Debate* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998).

In tandem with developments in public discourse, German studies scholarship was developing new theoretical models for understanding *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in terms of memory and memorialization, both for those who remember the Nazi period as well as the next generation of Germans who have no personal—or no adult memories—of the war. These include new cohort categories to describe generations vis-à-vis World War II,[307] as well as the emergence of memory studies as a subfield of German studies closely aligned with Holocaust studies. Within this nascent scholarly sphere, Marianne Hirsch and Leo Spitzer introduced the notion of "postmemory" to highlight the functioning of memory for those with personal connections to the war—especially the children of Holocaust survivors—but with no direct chain of memory transference. Rather, these later generations must rely on other kinds of artifacts to reconstruct their memory of a major historical rupture that is now increasingly recognized as a familial rupture, as well.[308] With respect to the translation of responses to the National Socialist legacy into a new disciplinary identity, this chapter will consider to what extent one might speak of an "institutional postmemory" in the case of *Volkskunde*.

Finally, succeeding the rise of public memorialization and memory studies was the emergence of a discourse of "normalization." As Stuart Taberner and Paul Cooke observe, by the twenty-first century, Germany had become "an accepted and respected partner, a widely admired champion of cooperation and peaceful coexistence, an esteemed friend of its former enemies, and a country which had learnt from its past and

---

[307] Susan Rubin Suleiman, "The 1.5 Generation: Thinking About Child Survivors and the Holocaust," *American Imago* 59, no. 3 (2002): 277–95; Susan Rubin Suleiman, *Crises of Memory and the Second World War* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006); Sigrid Weigel, "'Generation' as a Symbolic Form: On the Genealogical Discourse of Memory since 1945," *The Germanic Review: Literature, Culture, Theory* 77, no. 4 (2002): 264–77.

[308] For sources on German memory and postmemory studies, see the Introduction to Part I of the present work.

successfully aligned itself with liberal, democratic values."[309] In considering the developments in *Volkskunde*'s disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* from the 1980s to the present, this chapter will explore to what extent translations of this trope into positively valued disciplinary structures might indicate a semblance of normalization for a field—or at least parts thereof—that is reasserting its value in the public sphere and actively pursuing reintegration in the international anthropological community.

To trace how the trope of disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* is translated in historiography and institutional structures from the 1980s to the present, this chapter will examine journals, conference proceedings, introductory texts, edited volumes, and biographies published from the 1980s to the present. Ethnographic monographs will be considered only to the extent to which they reflexively situate present research in a historical trajectory. The analysis also will draw upon the interviews the author conducted with *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* university faculty members (current and emeritus) and their students as additional sources for recent articulations of the significance of the field's past for its present and future identity.

---

[309] Stuart Taberner and Paul Cooke, eds., *German Culture, Politics, and Literature into the Twenty-First Century: Beyond Normalization*, Studies in German Literature, Linguistics, and Culture (Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2006), 1. Scholarly treatments of "normalization" discourse across various social fields, but especially in the field of literature, can be found in Katharina Gerstenberger, *German Literature in a New Century: Trends, Traditions, Transitions, Transformations* (New York: Berghahn, 2008); Anne Fuchs, Kathleen James-Chakraborty, and Linda Shortt, eds., *Debating German Cultural Identity since 1989*, Studies in German Literature, Linguistics, and Culture (Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2011); Confino and Fritzsche, *The Work of Memory*; Siobhan Kattago, *Ambiguous Memory: The Nazi Past and German National Identity* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 2001); Stuart Taberner, *German Literature of the 1990s and beyond: Normalization and the Berlin Republic* (Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2005); Stuart Taberner and Frank Finlay, *Recasting German Identity: Culture, Politics, and Literature in the Berlin Republic* (Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2002); William John Niven and James Jordan, *Politics and Culture in Twentieth-Century Germany* (Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2003); Keith Bullivant and Bernhard Spies, eds., *Literarisches Krisenbewusstsein: Ein Perzeptions- und Produktionsmuster im 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich: Iudicium, 2001). Stuart Taberner and colleagues furthermore describe how German society—as captured in the public enunciations and literary treatments of German authors—is now moving "beyond normalization" as it continues to recognize and address past crises while facing new national and international challenges. See Taberner, *German Literature of the 1990s and beyond*; Taberner and Cooke, *German Culture, Politics, and Literature into the Twenty-First Century*.

The discussion does not proceed chronologically, but is rather divided between two themes that manifested concurrently: first, the place of the National Socialist period in institutional memory, and second, the place of successful *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, e.g., *Volkskunde*'s "1968," in institutional memory. As the themes naturally flow together, there will be some cross-reference between them. The analysis will show how the field of *Volkskunde* went on reforming its understanding of the field's Nazification in step with public and scholarly debates about Germany's past, but also translated the 1960s/70s critical discursive and structural responses that rupture into a new founding myth of disciplinary identity.

THIRD-WAVE DISCIPLINARY *VERGANGENHEITSBEWÄLTIGUNG*, 1980–1995

At the same time that public and intellectual *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* discourse turned a new corner of critical self-reflection and public controversy in the 1980s and 90s, explicit historiographic engagement with *Volkskunde*'s Nazi entanglements underwent three major narrative shifts that together mark a third wave of disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*. First, the object of research moved from a critique of *völkische* ideology—its historical roots and culmination in the Nazi period—to detailed case studies of *Volkskunde*'s involvements on the level of individual projects, institutes, and scholars. One begins to see this shift, for instance, in the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*, which published several articles on the history of *Volkskunde* between 1933 and 1945 in issues 78.2 (1982), 81.1 (1985), and 81.2 (1985).[310]

[310] Klaus Freckmann, "Hausforschung im Dritten Reich," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 78, no. 2 (1982): 169–86; Andreas Kuntz, "Anmerkungen zum Handwerk im Nationalsozialismus," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 78, no. 2 (1982): 187–99; Dietz-Rüdiger Moser, "Nationalsozialistische Fastnachsdeutung," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 78, no. 2 (1982): 200–229. Rolf Wilhelm Brednich, "Das Weigelsche Sinnbildarchiv in Göttingen: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Ideologiekritik der National-Sozialistischen Volkskunde," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 81, no. 1 (1985): 1–21; Klaus Freckmann, "Zur Foto- und Plandokumentation in

The turn to the specifics of everyday scientific practice was distinguished not only by a higher level of granularity concerning Nazi-era *Volkskunde* projects in Germany, but by an expanded research scope. Among the new topics broached were the fate of Jewish folklore studies and Jewish *Volkskundler*,[311] comparison between the Nazification of *Volkskunde* in Germany and Austria,[312] and comparison between *Volkskunde* and neighboring *Völkerkunde* under National Socialism.[313] *Volkskunde* research also was applied for studying the implications of anti-Semitism and militarism, thus furthering a shift in institutional memory from *Volkskunde* as a self-reflexively tainted field, to *Volkskunde* as a legitimate scientific field. In translating *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* into a tradition of self-criticism, the field had also reformed its *Aufgabe* to include contributing to scholarly and public understandings of cultural phenomena that not only

---

der Hausforschung der 30er und 40er Jahre: Das Beispiel des ehemaligen 'Bauernhofbüros' Berlin/Münster," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 81, no. 1 (1985): 40–50; Wolfgang Hesse and Christian Schröter, "Sammeln als Wissenschaft: Fotographie und Film im 'Institut für deutsche Volkskunde Tübingen' 1933–1945," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 81, no. 1 (1985): 51–75. Peter Assion, "'Was Mythos unseres Volkes ist': Zum Werden und Wirken des NS-Volkskundlers Eugen Fehrle," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 81, no. 2 (1985): 200–243.

311 See especially the work of Christoph Daxelmüller: "Jüdische Volkskunde in Deutschland vor 1933," in *Volkskunde als akademische Disziplin: Studien zur Institutionenausbildung: Referate eines Wissenschaftsgeschichtlichen Symposions vom 8.–10. Oktober 1982 in Würzburg*, ed. Wolfgang Brückner and Klaus Beitl, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte 414 (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1983), 117–42; "Nationalsozialistisches Kulturverständnis und das Ende der jüdischen Volkskunde," in *Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus: Referate und Diskussionen einer Tagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, München, 23. bis 25. Oktober 1986*, ed. Helge Gerndt (Munich: Münchner Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1989), 149–68.

312 See especially the conference publication, Wolfgang Brückner and Klaus Beitl, eds., *Volkskunde als akademische Disziplin: Studien zur Institutionenausbildung: Referate eines Wissenschaftsgeschichtlichen Symposions vom 8.-10. Oktober 1982 in Würzburg*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte 414 (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1983).

313 See especially the work of Thomas Hauschild and Hans Fischer: Thomas Hauschild, "Völkerkundler im 'Dritten Reich,'" in *Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus: Referate und Diskussionen einer Tagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, München, 23. bis 25. Oktober 1986*, ed. Helge Gerndt (Munich: Münchner Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1989), 245–60; Hauschild, *Lebenslust und Fremdenfurcht*; Fischer, *Völkerkunde im Nationalsozialismus*; Thomas Hauschild, "Christians, Jews and the Other in German Anthropology," *American Anthropologist* 99, no. 4 (1997): 746–53.

made the fascist takeover possible, but that are still present in contemporary German society.[314]

Turning attention away from the radical self-criticism that occurred within the broader context of cultural revolution and Cold War politics and expanding the scope of historiographic inquiry did not, however, mean that *Volkskunde* was overcoming the ideological and structural splintering that began in the 1960s. On the contrary, by the 1980s, discussion of the Nazi era among *Volkskundler* actually expanded the scope of criticism to begin challenging the hegemony of the radical Tübingen narrative. While the tone was less rancorous, this refocusing of criticism did not entirely eliminate the discord over interpretations of the implications of the field's Nazification that characterized the 1960s debates. To the contrary, the fault lines distinguishing *Volkskunde*'s divergent directions arguably became more visible in the 1980s and early 1990s as a greater diversity of voices contributed to the conversation. Indeed, as Regina Bendix recently asserted,[315] this expansion of discourse beyond the hegemonic voices of the "1968" reformers—for whom Hermann Bausinger, Wolfgang Emmerich, and Tübingen often served as synecdoche—also characterized the next major turn in *Volkskunde*'s historiographic treatment of the Nazi era.

Within the new proliferation of discursive performers, three groupings appeared: First, the narrative center of gravity shifted southward to the more conservative, historically oriented *Volkskunde* institutes, Munich, Würzburg, and Regensburg. Second, a younger cohort of *Volkskundler* began contributing to the conversation, with figures like Helge Gerndt (Munich) and Rolf Wilhelm Brednich (Göttingen) taking over

---

[314] See, for instance, Richard Albrecht, "Was ist der Unterschied zwischen Türken und Juden?," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 78, no. 2 (1982): 220–29; Albrecht Lehmann, "Militär als Forschungsproblem der Volkskunde," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 78, no. 2 (1982): 220–29.

[315] Bendix, "From 'Volkskunde' to the 'Field of Many Names,'" 374.

responsibility for the major articulations of disciplinary historiography. And third, German-speaking *Volkskundler* from Austria and the German Democratic Republic began taking part in conferences and publications organized in the Federal Republic.[316]

These first two shifts can be observed well in the proceedings of three conferences—1982 in Würzburg, 1986 in Munich, and 1991 in Kiel—dedicated to the history of *Volkskunde*. The first conference, co-organized by the *Volkskunde* institute chair Wolfgang Brückner and Vienna *Volkskundler* Klaus Beitl, aimed to broaden the conversation about disciplinary history by taking the frame of academic institutionalization, starting in the late eighteenth century, and by expanding the purview of inquiry to include other German-speaking areas—Austria, Switzerland, and German-speaking Prague. Still, the section on Nazi-era *Volkskunde* concerned Germany only.

While the scope of the contributions reflect the fact that academic institutionalization of the field as a whole (not just as an ancillary to fields like philology or history) only began to really take hold under the Nazi regime, Brückner criticizes the lingering obsession with that period. As was discussed in the previous chapter, Wolfgang Brückner was an outspoken opponent of the leftist *Volkskundler* and the radical disciplinary critique they forwarded in the 1960s and 70s. In his conference contribution, he explicitly accuses the reformers of initiating an unproductive tradition of historical naval-gazing—a "fast schon unreflektierte Dauerreflexion"[317]—and criticizes their reluctance to document a deeper disciplinary history.[318]

---

316 Early international conversations include the conferences documented in Helge Gerndt, ed., *Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus: Referate und Diskussionen einer Tagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, München, 23. bis 25. Oktober 1986* (Munich: Münchner Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1989); Brückner and Beitl, *Volkskunde als akademische Disziplin*.

317 "practically unreflected perpetual reflection." Wolfgang Brückner, "Die Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Volkskunde und die Institutionen-Erforschungen in den Geisteswissenschaften," in *Volkskunde als akademische Disziplin: Studien zur Institutionenausbildung: Referate eines Wissenschaftsgeschichtlichen Symposions vom 8.–10. Oktober 1982 in Würzburg*, ed. Wolfgang Brückner and Klaus Beitl,

While the conference may have been a genuinely well-meaning effort to raise awareness about historical figures, ideas, institutions, and projects that were overshadowed by postwar *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, extending the temporal reach of disciplinary critique beyond the Nazi past carried the implication that—though National Socialism and the havoc it wrought was still recognized as a defining pivot point for the field—Germany's *Volkskunde* had finally reached a stage where it could reflect on that period as part of a longer trajectory of disciplinary history. In the 1980s, such attempts to "normalize" *Volkskunde*'s history were met with accusations of revisionism, and Brückner himself soon became implicated in a debate that his opponents labeled the "*Volkskundlerstreit*,"[319] setting the enduring problem of *Volkskunde*'s past under Nazism on par with the better-known public "*Historikerstreit*" about the nature of Nazi fascism. That war of words waged by Jürgen Habermas, and critical historians Martin Broszat and Hans Mommsen, against so-called "revisionist" historians Ernst Nolte, Joachim Fest, and Andreas Hillgruber, among others, was hardly lost on the West German *Volkskundler*, as the debate was invoked time and again in this third wave of discussions of the field's Nazi involvements.

Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte 414 (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1983), 13, see also 16, 18–20.

Brückner, we recall from the previous chapter, was among the more conservative, dissenting voices at the Falkenstein conference. His concern for the infiltration of radical leftist ideology in the field and with it the apparent discarding of Volkskunde's century-long tradition bothered him greatly. In 1972 he lashed out against Wolfgang Emmerich and the Tübingen institute, as well as Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann at Marburg, for their supposed socialist alignments. In 1974 he left his position at the Lehrstuhl für Volkskunde in Frankfurt am Main—which the new chair, Ina-Maria Greverus, immediately renamed the Institute für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie—to take up the chair of *Volkskunde* at the University of Würzburg. In 1978 he became coeditor of the newly established *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* (renamed the *Jahrbuch für Europäische Ethnologie* in 2005 when he left the editorship).

[318] Of the fourteen speakers whose contributions were published in the volume, only one was among the critical commentators on Nazi-era Volkskunde in the 1960s: Gerhard Lutz (Hamburg). Martin Scharfe from the Tübingen institute attended. Hermann Bausinger, however, did not. Not one to mince words, Brückner took several direct swipes at the lead reformer. Ibid., 13, 16.

[319] Dow and Lixfeld, *The Nazification of an Academic Discipline*, 288–290.

Though Brückner's attempt was thwarted—in no small part because of his polemical style—he was, in retrospect, at the vanguard of a trend in recasting self-reflexive historiography as a standard practice serving the purpose of reinforcing *Volkskunde*'s new identity as a self-critical, and, by implication, ethical, legitimate, "normal" science, in Kuhn's sense. Indeed, those seeking to expand the scope of disciplinary historiography attempted to justify their position by aligning that historiographic work with the emerging field of the history and sociology of science. Brückner, for instance, explicitly links the work of the 1982 conference to recent studies in the history and sociology of disciplines, citing figures like Heinrich Dilly, Wolf Lepenies, Georges Canguilhem, and Michel Foucault.[320] This strategic positioning serves to shift the discourse and intentions of *Volkskunde* historiography from politically inflected self-criticism[321] referencing the rupture of National Socialism, to a common, even obligatory disciplinary practice that must help succeeding generations understand the emergence and institutionalization of *Volkskunde* in the full scope of its history.[322]

---

[320] Brückner, "Die Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Volkskunde," 24–27.

[321] Brückner criticizes postwar discarding of *Volkskunde*'s history, saying "Es scheint mir eine moralisch schwach kaschierte Selbstmonumentierung, wenn solche Kenntnisse für unsere Nachfahren zu Wissen deklariert werden, das nicht wissenswert sei im wissenschaftlichen Sinn." This tendency, he continues, was not just the project of the 1960s, however, but is true for the "aller relativ harmloseren Kenntnisse und Erfahrungen der letzten 30/40 Jahre." In other words, the Oedipal urge must be overcome, whatever the target of questioning may be. Ibid., 15. Still, it is clear from his presentation that he believes the culprits who drove the erasure of *Volkskunde*'s history were those at Tübingen. Ibid., 19.

[322] Brückner, "Die Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Volkskunde," 23. Brückner and Beitl together contribute a chapter on an exemplar project of disciplinary historiography—the wissenschaftsgeschichtliches Dokumentationzentrum in Mattersburg, Austria—that they suggest could be a model for German *Volkskunde*. They conclude by proposing concrete steps that can be taken in that direction. Wolfgang Brückner and Klaus Beitl, "Idee und Zielsetzungen eines wissenschaftsgeschichtlichen Dokumentationszentriums in Mattersburg," in *Volkskunde als akademische Disziplin: Studien zur Institutionenausbildung: Referate eines Wissenschaftsgeschichtlichen Symposions vom 8.–10. Oktober 1982 in Würzburg*, ed. Wolfgang Brückner and Klaus Beitl, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte 414 (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1983), 189–95.

Both the scope of inquiry and the chorus of historiographic voices researching *Volkskunde* in National Socialism would continue to expand with a 1986 conference in Munich, organized by Helge Gerndt in cooperation with the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde. Though this conference did not go so far as to take the microphone from the Tübingen cohort the way that Wolfgang Brückner sought to do, it did also invite a diversity of speakers representing various branches of *Volkskunde* (Brückner, however, was not in attendance), as well as neighboring disciplines including history and *Ethnologie*, and international perspectives, as well: both West- and East German, as well as Austrian and Italian. Now, rather than serving the purpose of exoneration by neutral association, Austria's *Volkskunde* was drawn into the same frame of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* as Germany's. East German *Volkskundler*, meanwhile, were beginning to engage in an even more belated process of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* for the field in their country.[323]

Like Wolfgang Brückner, Helge Gerndt was of the opinion that effacing the discipline's pre-1933 history would ultimately undermine the ethic of critical self-reflection the ideological critique of the 1960s hoped to institute. Disciplinary self-reflection, they agree, cannot be carried out solely with reference to the present or to the rupture of National Socialism, but rather must take the full history of the field into account.[324] But where Brückner mobilized emerging history of science studies to push past the trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, Helge Gerndt explicitly situates the Munich conference with reference to the *Historikerstreit* then raging in the public media; the solidification of *Volkskunde*'s ideological fracturing—the structural result of the second wave of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*—necessitated an explicit revisiting of the question

[323] The case of East German *Volkskunde* will receive more detailed attention in Part II of the present work.
[324] Gerndt, *Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus*, 13.

about the proper way to remember National Socialism and the Holocaust within disciplinary historiography.[325]

Broaching territory that could have provoked accusations of revisionism, contributors examined in closer detail cases of Nazi-era *Volkskundler*, such as John Meier and Adolf Spamer,[326] who embraced humanistic values and yet were strongly implicated in the field's Nazification. But rather than reviving the black-and-white rhetoric of white-washing, more civilized discussions often aimed at reevaluating the radical critiques of the 1960s themselves. Other presentations delved into the details of how certain institutions and projects were either established by or co-opted in service of the National Socialist regime. Specifics of *Volkskunde* theory and practice in the Nazi era were presented, but also comparative topics—Austrian and Italian *Volkskunde* under fascism, the end of Jewish *Volkskunde*, the Nazification of *Völkerkunde*, and dealings with the Nazi past in GDR *Volkskunde*—added new dimension to a narrative. Thus, one sees in both conferences how West German *Volkskunde*'s *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* was moving beyond the euphoria and polemics of reform toward a more nuanced relationship with its recent, troubled past.

Helge Gerndt would further establish himself as a leading voice in postwar *Volkskunde* historiography with the 1988 publication of his *Fach und Begriff "Volkskunde" in der Diskussion*, a collection of essays addressing the state of the discipline after World War II. Gerndt introduces the volume by invoking the heavy

---

[325] Ibid., 12–13.

[326] See, for instance, Anka Oesterle, "John Meier und das SS-Ahnenerbe," in *Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus: Referate und Diskussionen einer Tagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, München, 23. bis 25. Oktober 1986*, ed. Helge Gerndt (Munich: Münchner Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1989), 83–94; Hermann Strobach, "'. . . aber wann beginnt der Vorkrieg?' Anmerkungen zum Thema Volkskunde und Faschismus (vor und um 1933)," in *Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus: Referate und Diskussionen einer Tagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, München, 23. bis 25. Oktober 1986*, ed. Helge Gerndt (Munich: Münchner Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1989), 23–38; Jacobeit, "Auseinandersetzung mit der NS-Zeit in der DDR-Volkskunde."

debates of the 1960s and 70s and periodizing postwar disciplinary stock-taking according to the now standard pattern of the field's *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* traced in this work. This narrative pattern emblemizes the translation of that highly reflexive, yet socially situated rupture into an internal disciplinary tradition of self-reflexivity as the hallmark of the new denationalized, yet uniquely German *Volkskunde*.

Published in Metzler's academic series "Wege der Forschung," Gerndt's edition effectively canonizes a set of the field's narrative sites of postwar institutional memory—from the Maus-Peuckert debate, through Hans Moser's mid-1950s evaluation, Bausinger's critiques and recommendations, as well as one essay on the work of *Volkskunde* in the GDR.[327] Gerndt demonstrates self-reflexivity regarding the positionality and stakes of history-writing, noting that "Disciplinary history—like all history—is written in retrospect and structured by the standpoint of the present."[328] At the same time, he insists that history should not be reconstructed to legitimate the present state and structures of the field—a central Kuhnian notion echoed also by Wolf Lepenies[329]—, as this would obscure any meaningful historical insight. One must, in other words, read these selected texts mindful of the context in which they were penned.[330] Yet, beyond a twenty-page introduction that sets up the problem and purpose of disciplinary historiography and explains the periodization as he understands it, Gerndt deliberately provides little historical or interpretive scaffolding for the collection. The reader is thus encouraged to read the texts for what they are, and yet, Gerndt's choices for

[327] Gerndt also includes essays by Leopold Schmidt (1947); Jorge Dias (1956), Gerhard Heilfurth (1962), Jacobeit and Mohrmann (1968/69), Roland Narr (1970), and Gerhard Lutz (1971), as well as a full bibliography of programmatic works, 1946–1986.

[328] "Fachgeschichte wird—wie alle Geschichte—aus der Rückschau geschrieben und vom Gegenwartsstandpunkt her strukturiert." Gerndt, *Fach und Begriff "Volkskunde,"* 5.

[329] See the "Study Frameworks" chapter of the present work for an exposition of these theories.

[330] Gerndt, *Fach und Begriff "Volkskunde,"* 6.

inclusion indicate that the trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* still dominates the institutional memory, which the volume reinforces.

Carrying forward the new wave of disciplinary historiography, the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde cosponsored another international conference in 1991, this time in partnership with the Seminar für Volkskunde at the Christian-Albrechts-Universität Kiel. As at the Würzburg conference, the Kiel participants covered specific cases in the development of the field from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and, for the most part, excluded the typical West German reformers. However, their inclusion of numerous (suddenly now former) East German *Volkskundler* sets them in closer conversation with the Munich discussion.

Kai Detlev Sievers, in his introduction to the volume, invokes research in the sociology of knowledge and history of science, notably Thomas Kuhn's then-recent collaboration with German historian of science, Lorenz Krüger,[331] thus moving the translation of *Volkskunde* historiography forward, from overcoming a sordid past—the work of the 1960s/70s reformers—to establishing a scientifically regimented, ethically obligatory practice of historically and socially contextualized self-examination. Such critical reflection can never be objective, admits Sievers, but, echoing Brückner, disciplinarians are nonetheless obligated to continually engage in it so that each new generation can understand how the field's past informs its present. Moreover, this is not only an introspective matter; it is also a matter of legitimating the field in the eyes of its neighbors and governing institutions.[332] The purpose of disciplinary historiography thus

[331] Kai Detlev Sievers, ed., *Beiträge zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Volkskunde im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Neumünster: K. Wachholtz, 1991), 10.
[332] Ibid., 11.

had shifted from counteracting the delegitimation of Nazism to documenting a long tradition in pursuit of the status of Kuhn's "normal science."

In addition to the turn toward the details of *Volkskunde* under National Socialism and the increased diversity of voices contributing to the narrative, there was a third discrete shift characterizing this new wave of disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*: the internationalization of interest in the topic. We recall from the last chapter that West German *Volkskundler* introduced English-speaking scholars to the current state of their field with the 1968 special issue in the *Journal of Folklore Research* (5, no. 2/3). By the 1980s, American scholars in particular were joining West German discussions of *Volkskunde*'s history. The insightful 1987 article by American folklorist Mary Beth Stein outlining the phases of disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* already has been mentioned at several points in the present discussion. In addition, the American folklorists Alan Dundes (University of California, Berkeley) and Dan Ben-Amos (University of Pennsylvania) engaged rigorously with the field's history, attempting to set West German *Volkskunde* within an international context of defining contemporary folklore studies.[333]

In the mid-1980s, James R. Dow, a historian from Iowa State University, and Freiburg *Volkskundler* Hannjost Lixfeld together drove what would become a decade-long initiative to bring the internal debates over the discipline's twentieth-century history

[333] See, for instance, Dan Ben-Amos, James R. Dow, and Hannjost Lixfeld, "Zu einer Definition der Folklore im Kontext," *Jahrbuch für Volksliedforschung* 26 (1981): 15–30; Dan Ben-Amos, "Toward a Definition of Folklore in Context," *The Journal of American Folklore* 84, no. 331 (1971): 3–15; Alan Dundes, "Volkskunde, Völkerkunde and the Study of German National Character," in *Europäische Ethnologie*, ed. Heide Nixdorff and Thomas Hauschild (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1982), 257–66; Alan Dundes, ed., *International Folkloristics: Classic Contributions by the Founders of Folklore* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999); Alan Dundes, "Folkloristics in the Twenty-First Century (AFS Invited Presidential Plenary Address, 2004)," *Journal of American Folklore* 118, no. 470 (2005): 385–408. See also the dissertation by Dundes's, Ben-Amos's, and Bendix's doctoral student, Johanna Jacobsen, "Boundary Breaking and Compliance."

to an international, English-speaking audience. They began their collaboration with a 1986 collection of key programmatic texts from the 1960s and 70s, translated into English.[334] Including mainly contributions from the reformer camps, the book—as expressed in its subtitle, "A Decade of Theoretical Confrontation, Debate, and Reorientation"—homes in on the structural transformation resulting from the first wave of disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*.

Dow and Lixfeld went on to publish individual and joint articles in international English-speaking journals on the topic of German *Volkskunde* under Nazi fascism.[335] In 1994 the team produced two additional English-language volumes: a monograph by Lixfeld translated by Dow on the Reich Institute for German *Volkskunde*,[336] and another collection of translations, this time of a selection of essays on *Volkskunde* under National Socialism published between 1965 and the late 1980s, including a number presented at the 1986 Munich conference.[337] Finally, that same year, they collaborated with the GDR *Volkskundler* Wolfgang Jacobeit and the Austrian *Volkskundler* Olaf Bockhorn on a collection of historiographic essays covering the formation of *Volkskunde* in Germany and Austria in the first half of the twentieth century.[338] By that point, the term *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* had been absorbed into the field's self-description, as it titled

---

[334] Dow and Lixfeld, *German Volkskunde*.

[335] James R. Dow, "German Volkskunde and National Socialism," *The Journal of American Folklore* 100, no. 397 (1987): 300–304; Hannjost Lixfeld, "The Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and the Umbrella Organizations of German 'Volkskunde' during the Third Reich," *Asian Folklore Studies* 50, no. 1 (1991): 95–116; James R. Dow and Hannjost Lixfeld, "National Socialistic Folklore and Overcoming the Past in the Federal Republic of Germany," *Asian Folklore Studies* 50, no. 1 (1991): 117–53.

[336] Lixfeld, *Folklore and Fascism*. This was an expansion of his aforementioned 1991 article in *Asian Folklore Studies*.

[337] Dow and Lixfeld, *The Nazification of an Academic Discipline*.

[338] Wolfgang Jacobeit, Hannjost Lixfeld, and Olaf Bockhorn, eds., *Völkische Wissenschaft: Gestalten und Tendenzen der deutschen und österreichischen Volkskunde in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1994).

the concluding section on the German tradition: "Auseinandersetzung, Vergangenheitsbewältigung, und neue Wege. Volkskunde nach 1945."[339]

But while the notion of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* was applied in that volume to the first two decades after World War II, Dow and Lixfeld argue that *Volkskunde* did not make any significant progress in overcoming its Nazi past until the late 1980s[340]—that is, until discussion of the topic extended beyond the efforts of the Tübingen School. In their epilogue to the volume, "Overcoming the Past of National Socialist Folklore," they reprise the major turning points in internal dealings with the field's National Socialist baggage: the immediate postwar years, the critical turn of 1965–1971, and the historiographic research of the 1980s. The 1986 DGV working session in Munich they commend as having functioned, finally, not as "a tribunal," but as "scholarly inquiry, on location, so to speak, where much of the NS perversion had taken place."

Like Gerndt, they note how *Volkskundler* faced many of the same challenges that the historians did in the 1980s. But when it comes to remembering the tone of 1980s *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in *Volkskunde*, Dow and Lixfeld do not shy away from laying plain an internal division possibly as rancorous as the *Historikerstreit*: one side embodied by Wolfgang Brückner and his (alleged) subscription to the totalitarian theory that equated National Socialist and Marxist *Volkskunde*, and the other side embodied not by Bausinger and Emmerich, as one would expect, but by Dow and Lixfeld who openly criticized Brückner's revisionist tendencies.[341] Thus, these authors position themselves in institutional memory as the vanguard of the latest and most successful wave of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*.

---

339 "Debate, *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, and New Pathways. *Volkskunde* after 1945." Ibid., 334.
340 Dow and Lixfeld, *The Nazification of an Academic Discipline*, xi, xiii.
341 Ibid., 286, 288. Indeed, the authors claim that no conference in West Germany (or Austria) went on in the 80s that did not address the National Socialist period in some way (265).

Case studies of the details of *Volkskunde* under National Socialism would continue to appear through the succeeding decades.[342] At the same time, introductory texts intended for students, in the context of their presentation of the Nazi period, began to situate the "Aufarbeitung der Volkskunde in der NS-Zeit"[343] as the ultimate take-away when reading about that key rupture in disciplinary history. This is evidenced both in new or updated historiography[344] and in the continued reprinting of key critical works from

---

[342] See, for instance, Edgar Harvolk, *Eichenzweig und Hakenkreuz: Die Deutsche Akademie in München (1924–1962) und ihre volkskundliche Sektion* (Munich: Münchner Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1990); Ullrich Amlung, *Adolf Reichwein, 1898-1944: Ein Lebensbild des Reformpädagogen, Volkskundlers und Widerstandskämpfers* (Frankfurt am Main: Dipa-Verlag, 1999); Manfred Seifert, "Reichsarbeitsdienst und Volkskunde: Zur Instrumentalisierung volkskundlicher Inhalte, Personen und Institutionen durch nationalsozialistische Erziehung und Kulturarbeit," *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 17 (1994): 97–118; Manfred Seifert, *Kulturarbeit im Reichsarbeitsdienst: Theorie und Praxis nationalsozialistischer Kulturpflege im Kontext historisch-politischer, organisatorischer und ideologischer Einflüsse* (Münster: Waxmann, 1996); Otto Holzapfel, "Vergangenheitsbewältigung gegen den Strich: Überlegungen zur Debatte; John Meier und das Ahnenerbe," *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 14 (1991): 101–14; Andreas Martin, *Aus dem Nachlaß Adolf Spamers* (Dresden: Arbeitsgruppe Volkskunde am Institut für Geschichte der Technischen Universität Dresden, 1997); Sabine Besenfelder, *"Staatsnotwendige Wissenschaft": Die Tübinger Volkskunde in den 1930er und 1940er Jahren*, Untersuchungen des Ludwig-Uhland-Instituts der Universität Tübingen 94 (Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 2002).

[343] "Working through *Volkskunde* in the National Socialist period." This is a key phrase highlighted in the third edition of Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann's introduction to the field. Weber-Kellermann, Bimmer, and Becker, *Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie*, 132. However, this would not be the only text to play off of Adorno's infamous essay title, "Was bedeutet: Aufarbeitung der Vergangenheit?" Wolfgang Kaschuba, for example, speaks of the "Aufarbeitung der Fachgeschichte" when describing the disciplinary debates of the late 60s / early 70s.

[344] See, for instance, the new material added at the end of the section on National Socialism in the third edition of Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann's (now posthumously coedited) history that highlights the breadth and depth of disciplinary engagement with the Nazi past from Bausinger's circle in the 1960s to the conferences, collected volumes, and monographs mentioned in this section. Ibid., 132–136. Utz Jeggle's chapter on twentieth-century *Volkskunde* in Wolf Brednich's 1988/1994 *Grundriss der Volkskunde* also frames the topic in terms of the "Auseinandersetzung mit der NS-Zeit" Utz Jeggle, "Volkskunde im 20. Jahrhundert," in *Grundriß der Volkskunde: Einführung in die Forschungsfelder der europäischen Ethnologie*, ed. Rolf Wilhelm Brednich (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1994), 51–72. Helge Gerndt's student handbook, *Studienskript Volkskunde*, introduces the "wichtigst[e] aktuell[e] Problemstellung in der Volkskunde" with the disciplinary self-criticism and expansion of the field's "Aufgabenbereich" beginning in the 1960s, naming Falkenstein as a key turning point. Helge Gerndt, *Studienskript Volkskunde: Eine Handreichung für Studierende* (Münster: Waxmann, 1997), 30.

Wolfgang Kaschuba's *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*, the new standard introductory text according to my interviewees, dedicates eight pages to laying out the Nazi era that reflects the more complexifying interpretation forwarded in the 1980s and 90. He describes how *Volkskunde* only became an independent academic field through the scientific "seduction" of Nazism (70). He maintains the view that there was no intensive self-criticism in the early years, except to acknowledge the Munich School (Hans Moser and Karl-S. Kramer) as a beginning step in that direction. In contrast, he discusses the contributions

the 1960s and 1970s.[345] In this way, one sees beginning in the 1980s that, although the Nazi era was the impetus for change, the discipline's current identity is based on the positive, critical strides made by *Volkskundler* in facing their field's fascist entanglements. Thus, while Dow and Lixfeld claim that *Volkskunde* did not begin to truly deal with its activity under National Socialism until the 1980s, the way in which disciplinary historiography of that third wave also began positioning the two earlier waves of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* demonstrates how effectively the field integrated the trope into institutional memory—both narratively and structurally. The next section will explore how *Volkskunde*'s second wave of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* and its translation into institutional structures, would in turn be translated into a new founding myth—a past rupture that marks the beginning of the history of the present—upon which the field could build a new, legitimate identity.

FROM *VERGANGENHEITSBEWÄLTIGUNG* TO "NORMALIZATION," 1995 TO PRESENT

The years 1989/1990 were a watershed—indeed, a "*Wende*"[346]—for the German nation, as the FRG and GDR were officially reunified after forty years of separate

---

of the Tübingen School across four subsections of the chapter, "Entwicklungen" Volkskunde als Sozialwissenschaft?" Kaschuba's emphasis on the fundamental importance of this branch for the development of the field's present identity is perhaps unsurprising, as he was a student of Hermann Bausinger. Kaschuba, *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*, 70–95.

345 See, for example, Bausinger, *Volkskunde*, 1999; Hermann Bausinger, *Volkskultur in der technischen Welt* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2005); Hermann Bausinger et al., *Grundzüge der Volkskunde*, 4th ed. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1999). The first two works have been translated into numerous foreign languages, including English, Japanese, and Spanish, further solidifying the Tübingen School as the center of (West) German postwar *Volkskunde*.

346 "*Die Wende*," translatable as "the turning point," is a term frequently used to refer to the events surrounding German reunification in 1989/90. But the notion of "*Wendezeiten*" (periods of turning) is also used by scholars to refer to other major historical ruptures. See, for instance, Dirk Niefanger and Walter Erhart, *Zwei Wendezeiten: Blicke auf die deutsche Literatur 1945 und 1989* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1997); Hans Mayer, *Wendezeiten: Über Deutsche und Deutschland* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1993); Robert Weninger and Brigitte Rossbacher, eds., *Wendezeiten, Zeitenwenden: Positionsbestimmungen Zur Deutschsprachigen Literatur 1945–1995* (Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 1997).

statehood. This was, as scholars have observed, the first major step toward Germany's "normalization" in the world system. For *Volkskunde*, the years 1989/1990 also marked a milestone on the way to the field's "normalization" as a discipline, and specifically as a scientific discipline embedded in German postwar history. It was the twentieth anniversary of the meetings at Detmoldt and Falkenstein—an apt moment for stock-taking to which the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* dedicated a volume. The issue was, in other words, the translation of "Falkenstein" and the publications that precipitated it (especially the works by Emmerich and Bausinger) into a new foundational moment for the field—a "Neuanfang der Volkskunde"[347]—whereby *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* became a positive trope within institutional memory.

The editor of the *Falkenstein Protokolle*, Wolfgang Brückner, introduces the issue and candidly reiterates his opinion: that what many see as a revolutionary moment for the field was really the work of a small, but influential group of neo-Marxists deeply embedded in the Cold War politics and student revolt of the time. As for the effect of Falkenstein for the field, Brückner believes its preoccupation with self-criticism and the resulting splintering into various subfields are not sufficient grounding for a discipline's foundational identity. What is instead needed—and what he believes he and his students in Würzburg pursue—is a praxis-oriented *Volkskunde* that has rediscovered its traditional public mission sites ("*Aufgabenstellungen*"): "'Kulturarbeit' als Kulturaufklärung und nicht als Kulturrevolution,"[348] as he says. Reiterating the main divide that is the legacy of Falkenstein, Brückner insists on engagement with present cultural realities, not "luftigen

---

[347] "New beginning for *Volkskunde*." "Falkenstein vergessen?—Wir erinnern! (Reprint of 1989 Wahmbecker Resolution)," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 86, no. 2 (1990): 161.

[348] "Cultural work as cultural enlightenment, not as cultural revolution." Wolfgang Brückner, "Zwanzig Jahre nach Falkenstein oder der Rückkehr zur pluralen Normalität," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 86, no. 2 (1990): 156–157.

Schreibtischprodukten des blossen Diskurses."[349] Despite his skeptical remembrance of Falkenstein itself, Brückner enumerates several positive developments in the field since that time that confirm the field's growing profile, despite its still comparatively small size. Whether one was progressive or conservative, all the parties at Falkenstein wanted to see a renewal of the discipline, and that they have achieved.[350]

Veterans of Falkenstein, Dieter Kramer, Martin Scharfe, and Siegfried Becker (a student at that time), but also current students and new leaders in the field articulated their evaluation of the meeting's legacy. For the students who assembled their thoughts in a pamphlet—the so-called "Wahmbecker Resolution" drafted at the 1989 *Volkskunde* student meeting—many of the issues raised at Falkenstein remain unresolved: The field's name has not completely changed; its research profile is still largely object-, not problem-oriented; and the canon has not been sufficiently critiqued, leaving a serious deficit of cultural and social theory.[351] Moreover, the drafters argue, *Volkskunde* must orient itself towards the public sphere, studying contemporary cultural problems and sharing the results for the benefit of the public.[352]

But the most provocative piece in the issue was Andreas Bruck's article, entitled "Vergangenheitsbewältigung?! Kritische Anmerkungen zur Aufarbeitung der nationalsozialistischen Vergangenheit in der Volkskunde." After attempting a comprehensive overview and analysis of research on *Volkskunde*'s under National Socialism, Bruck forwarded the controversial argument that the idea that such

---

[349] "airy writing desk (or armchair)-productions of mere discourse." Ibid.

[350] Ibid., 158–160.

[351] "Falkenstein vergessen?—Wir erinnern! (Reprint of 1989 Wahmbecker Resolution)," 160–161.

[352] Ibid., 162. Together with the statement's reprinting, Rolf Lindner, of the Humboldt University of Berlin, provides a critical commentary on the *Wahmbecker Resolution* emphasizing that the problem of *Volkskunde*'s research profile is not so much the object- versus problem-oriented opposition, but rather the way that one carries out cultural research ("Untersuchungs*weise*").

historiography helps the field to overcome its Nazi past is false. For study of the Nazi period to truly affect *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, it cannot just describe the field's past; it must try to shape its present state.[353] For that to happen, argues Bruck, the discussion must go a step further to address the question of ethics in *Volkskunde*—a topic that had yet to be taken up, despite all the self-criticism and self-reflection that had taken place in the field since Falkenstein.[354]

Bruck's evaluation provoked a critical response, summarized by Sabine Künsting in the next issue of the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*. Regarding the study of *Volkskunde* under National Socialism, she states, "Andreas Bruck would like to have a hand in mastering and overcoming this inglorious past that reaches, at least in part, far into the postwar period, and in the same breath to hinder the emergence of similar occurrences."[355] Not only does Künsting object to Bruck's attempt at circumscribing, if not monopolizing, *Volkskunde*'s *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*. She also fears that his invocation of a disciplinary ethics would mean censorship of research deemed not sufficiently ethical or socially edifying.[356]

In response to Künsting's criticism, Bruck reiterates that his aim was to distinguish *Vergangenheitsaufarbeitung* from *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, the latter

---

353 Andreas Bruck, "Vergangenheitsbewältigung?! Kritische Anmerkungen zur Aufarbeitung der Nationalsozialitischen Vergangenheit in der Volkskunde," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 86, no. 2 (1990): 197–198.

354 Ibid., 199.

355 "Andreas Bruck möchte dazu beitragen, dieser z.T. weit in die Nachkriegszeit hinenreichenden, unrühmlichen Vergangenheit Herr zu werden, sie zu bewältigen und im selben Zuge das Entstehen ähnlicher Vorgänge zu verhindern." Sabine Künsting, "Hitler vorne, Hitler in der Mitte, Hitler hinten: Kritische Bemerkungen zu Andreas Bruck," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 87 (1991): 77.

356 She concludes, "Meine Zeilen entspringen ganz einfach der Furcht von übereifrigen Erfüllungsgehilfen im Dienste einer noch namenlosen neuen Machtclique, die sich zum Richter über ethisch vertretbare und ethisch nicht vertretbare Forschung aufspielt." ("My words spring very simply from the fear of overzealous agents in the service of a still nameless new power-clique that is playing judge over ethically defensible and ethically indefensible research.") However, when she references the authorization implied in Bruck's first footnote, which names Bausinger, Emmerich, Utz Jeggle, as well as Rolf Brednich, Helge Gerndt, and Hans Lixfeld, among others, it is clear who Sabine Künsting believes belongs to the clique. Ibid., 78.

involving, for *Volkskunde*, the pragmatic task of translating the past into a present personal and institutional research ethic. He does not find Künsting's fear of research censorship to be unfounded, only exaggerated. But Bruck does take exception with her implication that *Volkskunde* research is at worst a harmless waste of time, given its limited scope—the field's entanglements in National Socialism substantiates the reality of "indirect danger" cultural research could pose, hence the need for active self- and social-criticism as part of a general research ethic.[357]

The implications of the Nazi era for *Volkskunde* would be revisited on the occasion of a national—indeed, worldwide—anniversary: 1995, fifty years since the end of World War II. In 1996, Gottfried Korff published a chapter in a book coedited by memory studies scholar Sigrid Weigel concerning the "Nachgeschichte [aftermath] des Nationalsozialismus." Korff's contribution to this interdisciplinary collection identifies the naming debate and the paradigm shift that it represented as the main structural

[357] Bruck expresses these thoughts in his published response to Künsting: Andreas Bruck, "Ist kulturwissenschaftliches Forschen schlechtestenfalls nur harmlos? Eine Antwort auf Sabine Künsting," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 87 (1991): 79–83. Bruck's concern with the present effects of *Volkskunde*'s Nazification and the subsequent efforts at dealing with, if not overcoming, was shared by Helge Gerndt, despite the Munich conference he organized being a target of Bruck's critique. Like Bruck, he offers a comprehensive overview of the historiography on the topic, proposing to view the Nazification of *Volkskunde* as a complex cultural phenomenon with particular cultural implications (59–60). Answering his own question, "Was haben wir aus der Geschichte gelernt?," Gerndt concludes by summarizing five implications one can glean: 1) Scientific disciplines influence our everyday life, for better or for worse—for *Volkskunde*, this was a matter of defining German collective identity in alignment with Nazi ideology; 2) Scientific research can pose risks to human life, especially (though not only) when it is instrumentalized for political and economic purposes; 3) Science is comprised of the highly influential social history; contemporary *Volkskundler* must still maintain awareness of what cultural thinking produced in the Nazi period is still alive in society today; 4) Scientific work always requires deep reflection, and this includes the history of science as a source of collective memory—a memory that cannot be framed in polar opposites, but with attention to nuance and the power of discursive forms; and 5) Scientific disciplines must always maintain a critical eye to—and attempt to address the contemporary issues of—the broader social environment in a way that is self-reflexive and useful to the public that supports scientific work (63–64). Like Bruck, then Gerndt sees *Volkskunde*'s present and future identity as built upon lessons learned from its reflecting on the Nazi period—which is, to Bruck, the essence of overcoming the past. Helge Gerndt, "Deutsche Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus: Was haben wir aus der Geschichte gelernt?," *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde* 91, no. 1 (1995): 53–75.

outcome of *Volkskunde*'s *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*.[358] He describes the orientational splintering of the field in West Germany as an attempt to denationalize and internationalize a field that was traditionally thought of as "typisch deutsch" (typical German). To underscore the significance of the transformation that *Volkskunde* underwent in the preceding twenty years, Korff begins his essay with a quote from conservative historian Thomas Nipperdey, who described the field as a "merkwürdig[e] deutsch[e] Sonderwissenschaft"—a "strange, peculiarly German science" that is the "romantic and national version of a social scientifically oriented . . . cultural history."[359] By intoning this specifically disciplinary version of the German *Sonderweg* trope—a particular subdiscourse of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*—Korff attempts to show how *Volkskunde*, while admittedly a unique case among national anthropology traditions, has begun to move past its former nationalist identity.

Taking the Tübingen School to which he belonged as his narrative focus, Korff posits the department as the center of gravity whose reorientation from an overtly National Socialist program to a vanguard of self-reflective, empirical social/cultural research precipitated a more or less[360] discipline-wide shift in that direction. The "Dauerreflexion" criticized a decade earlier by Brückner, Korff situates as the result of

---

358 Korff, "Namenwechsel als Paradigmenwechsel?" This essay was also published in English the same year: Gottfried Korff, "Change of Name as Change of Paradigm: The Renaming of Folklore Studies Departments at German Universities as an Attempt at 'Denationalization,'" *Europaea* 2, no. 2 (1996): 9–32.

359 Korff, "Namenwechsel als Paradigmenwechsel?," 403. This English translation appears in Korff, "Change of Name as Change of Paradigm," 9. The quote comes originally from Thomas Nipperdey, "Die anthropologische Dimension der Geschichtswissenschaft," in *Gesellschaft, Kultur, Theorie: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur neueren Geschichte*, ed. Thomas Nipperdey (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1976), 42. Nipperdey repeats this diagnosis of *Volkskunde* in other works throughout the 1980s, and his description of *Volkskunde* as a "merkwürdige Sonderdisziplin" would appear frequently in self-reflections by *Volkskundler* on the history of of their field from the 1980s onward, as will be discussed further on in the present chapter.

360 Korff notes that, of course, not all departments followed this path—hence the ongoing problem of disciplinary splintering. His point is, not surprisingly, that Tübingen led the field's necessary ideological-epistemic reformation. Korff, "Namenwechsel als Paradigmenwechsel?," 404.

the field's uniquely thorough co-option by the Nazi regime, whereby Tübingen, arguably the institute that was most *belastet*, had to tap into the society-wide *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* most rigorously.[361]

Because of the field's by then ossified splintering, however, its present state and future—about which Korff is not entirely optimistic[362]—are still marked by the National Socialist legacy. Nevertheless, the ultimate implication is that the self-reflection now established as a core disciplinary practice through the naming debate—a structural shift translated into institutional memory—gives new meaning to the rupture of National Socialism. By replacing the disjointed, critical, and thus delegitimating story that characterized the first and second waves of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* with this new, legitimating historiographic narrative, *Volkskunde* could finally achieve a status akin to Kuhn's "normal science" and in step with the country's broader move toward political, economic, and social "normalization."

The crux of the field's pivotal 1970s naming debate, discussed in the previous chapter, was the problem of how nationalist ideology inhered in the central concepts—indeed, in the very name—of *Volkskunde*. While alternative frameworks like *Europäische Ethnologie* and *Kulturanthropologie* were meant to help lead the discipline out of what was now understood as a deeply historically rooted nationalist quagmire, questions about the significance and usefulness of the *Volk* concept hardly disappeared after Falkenstein. Even as the networks of like-minded institutes comprising the field

---

[361] Ibid., 409, 414–415.

[362] Despite the popularity of the major among university students, Korff sees the lack of new professorial hires, the high unemployment rate of graduates, a new dilettantism in cultural research, and the adoption of cultural studies by other fields to be threatening the future of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* / *Kulturanthropologie* / *Empirische Kulturwissenschaft* departments and the discipline in Germany in general. Ibid., 424–427.

solidified in the 1980s, leading voices continued insisting that the theory-*cum*-naming debate was not yet closed.[363]

As discussions about *Volk*, *Volkskultur*, and *Folklorismus* continued, the terms of the debate over the field's theoretical center also were beginning to shift: from *Volk* to *Kultur*. This terminological drift held two important implications. First, by finally abandoning *Volk* as the field's identifying concept, *Volkskunde*'s involvements in the National Socialist racist, imperialist ideological project could be situated as something past and overcome. Second, it indicated a new *Aufgabe* for the field with respect to its interaction with the public and neighboring fields, which were concurrently beginning to take an interest in questions of culture.[364]

A key articulation of this paradigm shift was presented by Wolfgang Kaschuba upon his installation in 1994 as chair of the Institut für Europäische Ethnologie at the

---

[363] See, for instance, the point / counterpoint articles by Hermann Bausinger and Helge Gerndt in the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 76 (1980) concerning how earlier debates about *Volkskunde*'s disciplinary identity can be understood in a new context: Hermann Bausinger, "Zur Spezifik volkskundlicher Arbeit," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 76 (1980): 1–21; Gerndt, "Zur Perspektive volkskundlicher Forschung." Konrad Köstlin, too, continues to reflect on the notion of *Volkskultur*, particularly with regard to the European expansion of *Volkskunde*'s research purview. See Konrad Köstlin, "Die Wiederkehr der Volkskultur: Der neue Umgang mit einem alten Begriff," *Ethnologia Europaea* 14 (1984): 25–31; Konrad Köstlin, "Der Begriff Volkskultur und seine vielfältige Verwendung," in *Münchner Streitgespräche zur Volkskultur: Dokumentation zur Tagung vom 28.–30. November 1986 im Hofbräuhaus am Platzl*, ed. Kulturreferat der Landeshauptstadt München (Munich: Buchendorfer, 1990), 12–15. See also Köstlin's 2000 *Festschrift*: Konrad Köstlin and Institut für Europäische Ethnologie, *Volkskultur und Moderne: Europäische Ethnologie zur Jahrtausendwende: Festschrift für Konrad Köstlin zum 60. Geburtstag am 8. Mai 2000* (Vienna: Selbstverlag des Instituts für Europäische Ethnologie, 2000). Other new voices that began contributing to the discussion of *Volk*, *Volkkultur*, and *Folklorismus* starting in the late 1980s include Andreas Schmidt, "Die Poesie der Kultur: Ein Versuch über die Krise der wissenschaftlichen Volkskunde," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 92 (1996): 66–76; Regina F. Bendix, *In Search of Authenticity: The Formation of Folklore Studies* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1997); Bendix, "Folklorism."

[364] Gottfried Korff, too, notes the increasing "*Kulturorientierung*" in the social sciences and humanities in the 1980s and how this positively impacted the style, themes, approaches, and interpretations within *Volkskunde*. Korff, "Namenwechsel als Paradigmenwechsel?," 423–424. For a more detailed account of the "cultural turn" in international scholarship, see Doris Bachmann-Medick, *Cultural Turns: Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften* (Reinbek: Rowohlt Taschenbuch, 2006).

Humboldt University of Berlin.[365] Kaschuba introduces his talk by describing the field as one that "sich in vieler Hinsicht noch auf der Suche befindet"—in search of an identity, that is. In the mid-1990s, *Volkskunde* still found itself navigating a disorienting proliferation of names and discerning how to balance historical and contemporary, and Germanist and Europeanist research.[366] However, Kaschuba's main focus in setting the tone for his tenure would be how *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* should react to the rise of "culturalism" in the social science and humanities, but also in the public sphere.[367] Culturalism could, on the one hand, indicate an emerging *Aufgabe* for the now highly self-reflexive field in informing public discourse and policy with respect to perceptions of identity and difference. This *Aufgabe* is all the more pressing, argues Kaschuba, precisely because culturalism poses a danger to civil society when "culture" becomes a euphemistic gloss for racism, ethnocentrism, nationalism, and other "virulent" misappropriations.[368] In that sense, *Volkskunde* has more than overcome its sordid past; it is to become a source of cultural research promoting intercultural understanding, tolerance, and cooperation for the betterment of society.[369]

While Kaschuba acknowledges that his field is still shoring up its identity after wartime and postwar turmoil, he does not frame its reflexive ethic in terms of German

---

[365] Kaschuba, "Kulturalismus: Vom Verschwinden des Sozialen im gesellschaftlichen Diskurs." The essay was published later in English as "Folklore and Culturalism," *Journal of Folklore Research* 36, no. 3 (1999): 173–78.

[366] "in many regards finds itself still searching." Kaschuba, "Kulturalismus: Vom Verschwinden des Sozialen im gesellschaftlichen Diskurs," 27.

[367] Ibid., 28.

[368] Ibid., 28–29.

[369] This critical social task would be seen as all the more pressing with the acceleration of European unification. As Gisela Welz asked in a plenary session of the 2003 meeting of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, the question for the field had now become: "Welchen Beitrag können ethnografisches Wissen und die Ethnologie als Kulturtechnik heute leisten zur Analyse von kulturellen Formen und zur konstruktiven Kritik von gesellschaftlichen Prozessen in Europa?" Gisela Welz, "Ethnografien europäischer Modernen," in *Ort. Arbeit. Körper: Ethnografie Europäischer Modernen. 34. Kongress der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, Berlin 2003*, ed. Beate Binder et al. (Münster: Waxmann, 2005), 19.

Vergangenheitsbewältigung, but rather connects this with European and US-American turns toward a reflexive anthropology.[370] These three elements—1) the connection to international anthropology, 2) the professed concern for counteracting a reemergence of racist nationalism, and 3) Kaschuba's translation of early cultural research in Germany from studying a national *Volk* to human *Kultur*[371]—ultimately serve to demonstrate that Germany's *Volkskunde*, though it proceeded on a unique path—a disciplinary *Sonderweg*—and still bears the institutional memory of the Nazi rupture in its organizational structures and historiographic narratives, has nonetheless successfully overcome that past and integrated itself with contemporary anthropological turns in cultural thinking. Now able to consider questions of culture from an international, ethical-scientific higher ground, *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* was reaching an ever more solid state of normalization.[372]

The shift from *Volk* to *Kultur* as the fulcrum of disciplinary theorizing did not represent a complete renaissance or stabilization of theory for the field, however. In 2008, James Dow—often channeling Gottfried Korff's thoughts recorded in the 1996 essay discussed above—offers a diagnosis of *Volkskunde*'s current use of theory, in a historical

---

[370] Kaschuba, "Kulturalismus: Vom Verschwinden des Sozialen im gesellschaftlichen Diskurs," 33–35.

[371] For example, Kaschuba does not directly follow the pattern of earlier proposals for *Volkskunde* to return to its roots in Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl's social criticism, but rather cites—or translates—Riehl's cultural research as one of several German scientific traditions contributing to contemporary understandings of the meaning and interpretation of culture. What Riehl contributed, he notes, was the realization that "kulturelle Identitat und Authentizität an ethnozentrischen und wertkonservativen Horizonten festmachte." Ibid., 33.

[372] Further discussions of the expanding use of culture and the challenge this poses to the identity of *Volkskunde* as an independent field can be found in Eggmann, *"Kultur"-Konstruktionen*; Helge Gerndt, "Zielorientierungen oder: Wieviele Kulturbegriffe braucht Volkskunde als empirische Kulturwissenschaft," in *Kultur—Ein interdisziplinäres Kolloquium zur Begrifflichkeit, Halle an der Saale, 18. bis 21. Februar 1999*, ed. Siegfried Fröhlich (Halle an der Saale: Landesamt für Denkmalpflege und Archäologie Sachsen-Anhalt, 2000), 215–28; Rolf Lindner, "Konjunktur und Krise des Kulturkonzepts," in *Kulturwissenschaften: Forschung—Praxis—Positionen*, ed. Lutz Musner and Gotthart Wunberg (Vienna: WUV-Üniversitäts-Verlag, 2002), 69–87; Bernd Jürgen Warneken, "Zum Kulturbegriff der Empirischen Kulturwissenschaft," in *Kultur—Ein interdisziplinäres Kolloquium zur Begrifflichkeit, Halle an der Saale, 18. bis 21. Februar 1999*, ed. Siegfried Fröhlich (Halle an der Saale: Landesamt für Denkmalpflege und Archäologie Sachsen-Anhalt, 2000), 207–13.

context.[373] It is Dow's contention that, despite the strides made in critiquing and overcoming its Nazification, since the "Abschied vom Volksleben" heralded by the Tübingen School in the 1960s/70s, *Volkskunde* still remains theoretically dispersed—too dispersed to bear a grand theory of culture, and in fact still highly resistant to it.

What Korff presented as a positive diversification of interest areas Dow sees as an implicit, ongoing rejection of a grand theory of culture. Dow concludes, pessimistically, that what resulted "is a kind of *Kulturalismus* and sometimes an annoying naïve empiricism . . . a kind of dilettantism in the name of a broader understanding of culture."[374] Furthermore, Dow sees the emergence of multifarious interdisciplinary cultural studies fields since the 1980s—a fact also noted by Kaschuba—as new venues of collaboration, but also as competition for jobs—academic and nonacademic—for students of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie*.[375] Continuing to dicker about the proper name and theoretical orientation of the field is part of the problem. But in contrast to Kaschuba's proposed turn to studying and theorizing *Kultur*, Dow's proposed solution is to revisit the central grand theories of folklore—a subfield of cultural anthropology most closely aligned with classic *Volkskunde*—in order to give the field some parameters. Shoring up a common identity is not, however, the path that Germany's *Volkskundler* / *Europäische Ethnologen* chose to take.

Instead of gravitating toward one orientation or another, by the 1990s the field's splintering became its identity. Reframed as a unique, now positively valued, identifying characteristic of formerly unified *Volkskunde*, the field's very diversity—cast as the

---

[373] Dow, "There Is No Grand Theory in Germany, and for Good Reason."
[374] Ibid., 59–60.
[375] Dieter Kramer reiterates this anxiety about the status of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* vis-à-vis the *Kulturwissenschaften*. On the one hand, *Volkskunde* must be recognized as one of the*Kulturwissenschaften*. On the other hand, it is the member that is too often forgotten. Kramer, *Europäische Ethnologie und Kulturwissenschaften*, 18.

legacy of 1970s disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*—was thus translated from a persistent problem[376] into a commonplace and even into a positive framing akin to the European Union's official motto (as of 2000): "unity in diversity."[377] For instance, Harm-Peer Zimmermann's 2005 student guide book not only lists the four main disciplinary names in its title, but situates the *Umbennenung* as emerging from the "68er's" critique of *Volk* ideology and now yielding a broadened thematic and methodological horizon.[378] Indeed, it was the 1990s cultural turn, he claims, that solidified the field's unified identity as *the* Germanist / Europeanist cultural discipline.[379] As Reinhard Johler also explained to me in an interview, the diverse institute names bespeak the field's long history upon which succeeding generations must continue to reflect, but also a dynamic present and future.[380]

Yet this translation has been marked by a touch of chagrin. In the 1990s, the nickname "*Vielnamenfach*"—"field of many names"—came into currency as shorthand for speaking of the field's diverse theoretical and methodological orientations. One of the first published usages of the term appeared in a special footnote to Gottfried Korff's 1996

---

376 Another example of this is Martin Scharfe's reference to the *Umbenennung* as a persistent issue, the results of which are satisfying to no one. Martin Scharfe, *Brauchforschung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1991), 1n2. More cynically, Wolfgang Brückner speaks of disciplinary namings using scare quotes and asides, referring to "die neue 'Facher'-Situation und zukünftige Ansiedelung von 'Volkskunde' (oder was immer dafür an schönen Namen)" Brückner, "Die Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Volkskunde," 18.

377 "The EU Model," *European Union*, accessed April 20, 2015, http://europa.eu/about-eu/basic-information/symbols/motto/index_en.htm.

378 Zimmermann, *Empirische Kulturwissenschaft, Europäische Ethnologie, Kulturanthropologie, Volkskunde*, 11.

379 Ibid., 12. Ingeborg-Weber Kellermann, Andreas C. Bimmer, and Siegfried Becker, in their 2003 edition of the standard Marburg introduction to the field, reiterate the significance of the cultural turn for the field's identity, noting also that certain departments appended their titles in order to emphasize their cultural orientation. Weber-Kellermann, Bimmer, and Becker, *Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie*, 192.

380 Johler, interview. On the positive valuation of *Volkskunde*'s contemporary unity in diversity, see also Kaschuba, *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*, 13.

article on the legacy of the naming debate, discussed above.[381] Later, in one of first comprehensive *Volkskunde* methodology handbooks, Silke Göttsch and Albrecht Lehmann use the term more deliberately to reference the field's "unterschiedlich[e] Positionen und Arbeitsweisen."[382]

Since then, the original naming debate and its imprinting in institutional memory—narrative and structural—have been examined as a topic unto itself, with publications aimed at both German-speaking and international English-speaking audiences.[383] In my interviews with current and emeritus faculty members, the field's dispersed identity—referred to by some (often with a grin) as a "Schrägstrich" (slash)-field—is largely accepted as a commonplace. Not only in introductory texts, but also in official meetings, the spectrum of dominant names is used.[384] The many, often hyphenated names of the "*Vielnamenfach*" are thus now more a problem of language translation for the outside than of intradisciplinary conflict.[385]

---

[381] Korff, "Change of Name as Change of Paradigm," 9.

[382] Göttsch and Lehmann, *Methoden der Volkskunde*, 7.

[383] Bendix and Eggeling, *Namen und was sie bedeuten*; Bendix, "From 'Volkskunde' to the 'Field of Many Names.'"

[384] This is true, for instance, for the annual doctoral student meeting of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde. See Eva Zimmer, "Siebte Doktorandentagung der Volkskunde / Europäischen Ethnologie / Kulturanthropologie / Empirischen Kulturwissenschaft. Lehrstuhl für Europäische Ethnologie der Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg, 11.–13. Mai 2012," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 108 (2012): 111ff.; Linda Witte, "Sechste Doktorandentagung der Volkskunde / Europäischen Ethnologie / Kulturanthropologie / Empirischen Kulturwissenschaft. Institut für Kulturanthropologie / Europäische Ethnologie an der Georg-August Universität, Gottingen, 18.–20. März 2011," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 107 (2011): 202ff.

[385] Dieter Kramer reiterates this point in one of the most recently published introductions to the field, stating, "Die Uneinheitlichkeit der Benennung macht allen Studierenden zu schaffen und markiert für Außenstehende eine unübersichtliche und verwirrende Vielfalt. Ihr entspricht eine Vielfalt der Themen und Schwerpunkte." Kramer, *Europäische Ethnologie und Kulturwissenschaften*, 14.

Indeed, even I had to remind myself before each interview what nomenclature was associated with which institute and individual interlocutor. That the field's internal diversity has been translated in institutional memory into a key characteristic of its present identity is not to suggest, however, that all of its branches have come together again to share the same intellectual space. Several interview partners noted, for instance, how networks of collaboration or intellectual genealogy can be observed via which institutes have the strongest presence at a given meeting of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde. One also can observe a persistent identity cleavage in practitioners' individual self-identification. When I asked

The title *Europäische Ethnologie* is most often taken as the umbrella term for the field today, as it captures its unique methodological contribution (ethnography) to the study of cultural phenomena, its broadening regional scope and comparative perspective, and its connection with other national European cultural anthropologies. Nonetheless, only half (thirteen out of twenty-six) of the German institutes organized under the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde currently contain the title *Europäische Ethnologie* (two of them as the exclusive title). Nearly half (twelve) still contain the title *Volkskunde* (two as the exclusive title).[386] But, as Harm-Peer Zimmermann explains in his student handbook, institutes retaining *Volkskunde* in their titles are not practicing some old-fashioned ("altgebackene") *Volkskunde*—they, too, have undergone the social and cultural turns like the rest of the field. The choice to continue with the classic title is often rather a matter of being unable to find a suitable alternative that adequately describes an institute's work.[387] Helge Gerndt similarly observes in his student handbook: "The name of a science is a label that can never quite express its changing contents and charges."[388]

The present state of disciplinary historiography likewise indicates that, although the field's diversity is an accepted commonplace and even touted as a positive characteristic,[389] its institutional memory still remains splintered as a result. Main

---

interviewees how they identify themselves—for instance, on a business card or professional biography website—most often respondents chose either *Ethnologe/in* or *Volkskundler/in*.

386 The title *Kulturanthropologie* is contained in the names of eight institutes, and only one of these as the exclusive title. See http://www.d-g-v.org/institutionen/universitaetsinstitute (accessed January 21, 2015) for the complete list.

387 Zimmermann, *Empirische Kulturwissenschaft, Europäische Ethnologie, Kulturanthropologie, Volkskunde*, 12. While the exclusive use of *Volkskunde* in institute names is today very rare, the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde and its publishing organ, the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*, retain that title as a means of recalling the field's centuries-old identity. Conveniently, the classic name also distinguishes the field from neighboring cultural disciplines in the German-speaking world and from other national anthropological traditions. Thus, while *Volkskunde* is no longer the field's sole or most prominent identity, in a sense it is still its fundamental historical identity.

388 "Der Name einer Wissenschaft ist ein Etikett, das die sich wandelnden Inhalte und Aufgaben niemals genau zum Ausdruck bringen kann." Gerndt, *Studienskript Volkskunde*, 74.

389 See, most recently, Bendix, "From 'Volkskunde' to the 'Field of Many Names,'" 264.

contributors to the historiography readily acknowledge that no one has ever written a comprehensive history of the field—even the best attempts are self-consciously insufficient, for the field, they say, is simply too diverse and complex to capture in one volume.[390] Moreover, the most comprehensive introductory textbooks and handbooks, even while offering similar accounts from the field's origins to its present diversity, still typically take the perspective of each author's institution as representative of the current state of the field. Either the volume's title already gives the punchline away—as in the Munich-produced *Studienskript Volkskunde* and *Volkskunde als historische Kulturwissenschaft* volumes—or the work attempts to normalize the "*Vielnamenfach*" by integrating its branches—as in the coedited volume *Methoden der Volkskunde. Positionen, Quellen, Arbeitsweisen der Europäischen Ethnologie*.[391] This tendency may be less an effect of institutional hubris or lingering conflict between the field's main factions, and more an effect of a translation of disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* concerning the Nazi period into a general aversion toward master narratives.

The dispersion of contemporary disciplinary historiography also is reinforced by the frequent practice of individual institutes publishing on their own histories and contributions to the field. For example, Tübingen's Institut für Empirische Kulturwissenschaft is still among the most prolific in producing institutional identity narratives. [392] The Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie, chaired

---

[390] Ibid., 365; Kaschuba, *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*, 15; Dow and Lixfeld, *German Volkskunde*, 7; Weber-Kellermann, Bimmer, and Becker, *Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie*, vi.

[391] See, for instance, Gerndt, *Studienskript Volkskunde*; Kaschuba, *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*; Weber-Kellermann, Bimmer, and Becker, *Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie*; Brednich, *Grundriß der Volkskunde*; Wolfgang Brückner, *Volkskunde als historische Kulturwissenschaft: Gesammelte Schriften* (Würzburg: Bayerische Blätter für Volkskunde, 2000); Göttsch and Lehmann, *Methoden der Volkskunde*; Kramer, *Europäische Ethnologie und Kulturwissenschaften*.

[392] See, for instance, Hermann Bausinger, *Volkskunde als empirische Kulturwissenschaft* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1987); Warneken, "Zum Kulturbegriff der Empirischen Kulturwissenschaft"; Reinhard Johler, Bernhard Tschofen, and Esther Hoffmann, eds., *Empirische Kulturwissenschaft: Eine Tübinger Enzyklopädie. Der*

first by Ina-Maria Greverus and now by her student and successor, Gisela Welz, established a prominent identity as a Europeanist institute bridging Germany's *Kulturanthropologie* / *Europäische Ethnologie* and US-American cultural anthropology.[393] The Institut für Europäische Ethnologie / Kulturwissenschaft[394] at the Philipps Universität-Marburg maintains the tradition begun by Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann of publishing central introductions to the field, positioning itself as a bridge between the different orientations constituting the field.[395] The Institut für Europäische Ethnologie at the Humboldt University has published frequently on the field's practice in Germany, but especially in Berlin as a bridging point between the East- and West German postwar traditions.[396] The internet now also affords all institutes the opportunity

---

Reader des Ludwig-Uhland-Instituts (Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 2008); Hermann Bausinger, "Ungleichzeitigkeiten: Von der Volkskunde zur empirischen Kulturwissenschaft," in *Kultursoziologie—Symptom des Zeitgeistes*, ed. Helmuth Berking and Richard Faber (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1989), 267–85.

393 See, for instance, Greverus, *Forschendes Lernen und der Studentenberg*; Ina-Maria Greverus and Christian Giordano, eds., *Kultur anthropologisch: Eine Festschrift für Ina-Maria Greverus* (Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie der Universität Frankfurt am Main, 1989); Ina-Maria Greverus, ed., *Kulturtexte: 20 Jahre Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie* (Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie der Universität Frankfurt am Main, 1994); Greverus, *Kultur und Alltagswelt*. The institute's anthropological / Europeanist orientation is also carried forward in the *Anthropological Journal on European Cultures* founded there.

394 The Marburg institute for *Volkskunde* adopted the title Institut für Europäische Ethnologie und Kulturforschung in 1970, and replaced "Kulturforschung" with "Kulturwissenschaft" in 1998.

395 Weber-Kellermann, Bimmer, and Becker, *Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie*; Weber-Kellermann, *Einführung in die Volkskunde, Europäische Ethnologie*; Weber-Kellermann, *Deutsche Volkskunde zwischen Germanistik und Sozialwissenschaften*. See also the *Festschrift* for Weber-Kellermann: Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, Andreas C. Bimmer, and Dorothea Zeh, *Europäische Ethnologie in der beruflichen Praxis: Berichte aus Museum und Hochschule: Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann zum 26. 6. 1983 gewidmet von ihren Schülern* (Bonn: R. Habelt, 1983). Harm-Peer Zimmermann's student guidebook also may be counted as part of Marburg's contribution to institutional and disciplinary identity performances. Zimmermann, *Empirische Kulturwissenschaft, Europäische Ethnologie, Kulturanthropologie, Volkskunde*.

396 Thomas Scholze and Leonore Scholze-Irrlitz, eds., *Zehn Jahre Gesellschaft für Ethnographie—Europäische Ethnologie in Berlin: Wolfgang Jacobeit zum 80. Geburtstag* (Münster: LIT, 2001); Kaschuba, *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*. See also select essays in the collection, Ina Dietzsch, Wolfgang Kaschuba, and Leonore Scholze-Irrlitz, eds., *Horizonte ethnografischen Wissens: Eine Bestandsaufnahme* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2009).

to present their particular character and history, revealing again the contours of disciplinary diversity.

To the institute histories one also must add the biographies and autobiographies (often cowritten with their students) of figures like Hermann Bausinger, Ina-Maria Greverus, and Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, who were thereby established as key fulcra in *Volkskunde*'s postwar reformation and resurrection in the 1960s/70s—founding figures in the field's new origin myth.[397] The auto/biographical stories of these three figures in particular locate them not just as leaders in their field, but in the West Germany and international cultural revolution. Bausinger's biography, for instance, connects him with members of the German critical author collective, *Gruppe 47*,[398] and the neo-Marxist Birmingham Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies.[399] Greverus and Weber-Kellermann, meanwhile, are situated at the vanguard of the movement for gender equality in West German academia.[400]

The oft-noted lack of a comprehensive, unified account of the field's history thus not only reveals, but further reserves a space for disciplinary identity narratives to continue proliferating into the twenty-first century. Besides institute-specific

---

[397] See, for instance, Sabine Doering-Manteuffel, "Das Weltkind in der Mitte: Hermann Bausinger zum 70. Geburtstag," *Augsburger Volkskundliche Nachrichten* 2, no. 2 (1996): 33–51; Bausinger, *Ein Aufklärer des Alltags*. Groffmann et al., *Kulturanthropologinnen im Dialog*; Lutz et al., "Ina-Maria Greverus: Aufbruch in die Kulturanthropologie." Heidrun Alzheimer-Haller, *Frauen in der Volkskunde, in der Empirischen Kulturwissenschaft, der Europäischen Ethnologie / Ethnographie und Kulturanthropologie in Deutschland* (Würzburg: Bayerische Blätter für Volkskunde, 1994); Weber-Kellermann, Becker, and Bimmer, *Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann*; Elke Gaugele, "Von Zeiten und Zeichen: Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann (1918–1993)," in *Mass nehmen, Mass halten: Frauen im Fach Volkskunde*, ed. Elsbeth Wallnöfer (Vienna: Böhlau, 2008), 79–112.

[398] Bausinger, *Ein Aufklärer des Alltags*, 19.

[399] Ibid., 136. Gottfried Korff and Reinhard Johler also note the connection to the CCCS. However, in much of the literature by and about Bausinger and the Tübingen School, rather than claiming a direct interaction, its mention appears as a belated, somewhat speculative reflection on the international significance of the Institute's contribution to ushering in a paradigm shift. See Korff, "Namenwechsel als Paradigmenwechsel?," 423; Johler, interview.

[400] See, for instance, Groffmann et al., *Kulturanthropologinnen im Dialog*, 43–48; Weber-Kellermann, Becker, and Bimmer, *Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann*, 27.

historiography, the narrative field is populated by historically oriented conferences[401] and research projects,[402] "*Bestandsaufnahmen*" (stock-taking) and "*Fachprofile*" (disciplinary profiles).[403] Across these sites of institutional memory, moreover, one finds increasing signs of normalization.

Case studies of the details of *Volkskunde*'s practice between 1933 and 1945 continue to appear, in both German and English. While some still take up the classic problem of the boundary between science and the political sphere that characterized the second and third waves of disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*,[404] the latest wave of case studies more often situates National Socialism as one among several influences on the development of the field in the mid-twentieth century, thus broadening the temporal and social scopes of inquiry.[405] As the trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* loses its magnetism, disciplinary historiography is recollecting earlier ruptures and milestones in

---

401 For example, Britta Spies, "Zur Geschichte der Volkskunde: Personen-Programme-Positionen. Tagung des Instituts für Sächsische Geschichte und Volkskunde e.V., Dresden, 20/21. November 2000," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 98 (2002): 65ff.; Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, "Zur Situation der Volkskunde 1945-1970: Orientierungen einer Wissenschaft in Zeiten des 'Kalten Krieges.'" Ludwig Maximilian Universität München, 09.–11.5.2013," Conference Program, (2013), http://www.d-g-v.org/sites/default/files/programm_tagung_fachgeschichte_1945_bis_1970_neu.pdf.

402 Take, for example, the 2006–2013 Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft-sponsored project, "Volkskundliches Wissen und gesellschaftlicher Wissenstransfer: Zur Produktion kultureller Wissensformate im 20. Jahrhundert", a research collaboration among scholars from institutes of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* in Frankfurt am Main, Göttingen, Kiel, Berlin, and Tübigen. http://www.volkskundliches-wissen.uni-tuebingen.de/

403 Gottfried Korff and Gudrun M. König, eds., *Volkskunde '00. Hochschulreform und Fachidentität: Hochschultagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde* (Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 2001); Dietzsch, Kaschuba, and Scholze-Irrlitz, *Horizonte ethnografischen Wissens*; Sonja Windmüller, Beate Binder, and Thomas Hengartner, eds., *Kultur-Forschung: Zum Profil einer volkskundlichen Kulturwissenschaft* (Berlin: LIT, 2009).

404 See, for instance, Steffen Raßloff, "Martin Wähler (1889–1953): Volkskundler im Spannungsfeld von Wissenschaft und völkischer Ideologie," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 102, no. 2 (2006): 195–219.

405 See, for instance, Michaela Fenske, "The Undoing of an Encyclopedia: Knowledge Practices within German Folklore Studies after World War II," *Journal of Folklore Research* 47, no. 1/2 (2010): 51–78; Thomas A. Green, "Peuckert's Handwörterbuch and the Making of Twentieth-Century Encyclopedias," *Journal of Folklore Research* 47, no. 1 (2010): 79–88; Antonia Davidovic-Walther and Gisela Welz, "Community Studies as an Ethnographic Knowledge Format," *Journal of Folklore Research* 47, no. 1/2 (2010): 89–112; Dani Schrire, "Raphael Patai, Jewish Folklore, Comparative Folkloristics, and American Anthropology," *Journal of Folklore Research* 47, no. 1/2 (2010): 7–43.

institutional memory, such as *Volkskunde* practices in World War I[406] and the *Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde*,[407] and even revisiting the critical evaluations of the field's ideological foundations.[408]

What is more, the history of *Volkskunde* is increasingly studied in terms of the production of scientific knowledge.[409] This trend reflects a broader interest in epistemology—both presentist and historical, specialist and popular—within trans-Atlantic cultural anthropology, bringing the field in close conversation with studies in the history and sociology of science.[410] For cultural anthropologists, as Hermann Bausinger recently discussed, studying the history of their field concerns the "subjective embedding

---

406 Eva Zwach, "Ein Volkskundler im Ersten Weltkrieg: Wilhelm Pessler und die Kriegsmuseum," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 95, no. 1 (1999): 14–31; Gottfried Korff, *KriegsVolksKunde: Zur Erfahrungsbindung durch Symbolbildung* (Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 2005); Reinhard Johler, "Laboratory Conditions: German-Speaking Volkskunde and the Great War," in *Doing Anthropology in Wartime and War Zones: World War I and the Cultural Sciences in Europe*, ed. Reinhard Johler, Christian Marchetti, and Monique Scheer (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2010), 123–40.

407 The *Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde* was not entirely forgotten during the postwar period—indeed, the archived survey and cartographic materials collected between 1928 and 1984 still provide a valuable source of historical / ethnographic research. The topic has been newly resurrected in translating *Volkskunde* mid-twentieth century historiography from *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* into history and sociology of science, specifically as part of a Franz Steiner Verlag series on the history of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, which funded the *Atlas* among many other research projects. Günter Wiegelmann, "The Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde and the Geographical Research Method," trans. Joan L. Cotter, *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 5, no. 2/3 (1968): 187–97; Gerda Grober-Glueck, "Zum Abschluss des Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde—Neue Folge. Ein Beitrag zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Volkskunde," in *Wandel der Volkskultur in Europa: Festschrift für Günter Wiegelmann zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Günter Wiegelmann and Nils Arvid Bringéus (Münster: F. Coppenrath, 1988), 53–71; Friedemann Schmoll, *Die Vermessung der Kultur: Der "Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde" und die Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, 1928–1980* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2009).

408 Bernd Jürgen Warneken, "'Völkisch nicht beschränkte Volkskunde': Eine Erinnerung an die Gründungsphase des Fachs vor 100 Jahren," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 95 (1999): 169–96.

409 See, for instance, the special issue of *Journal of Folklore Studies* (47, no. 1/2) on ethnological knowledges edited by Michaela Fenske and Antonia Davidovic-Walther, especially the introductory essay, Davidovic-Walther and Fenske, "Exploring Ethnological Knowledges." See also Kaschuba, *Wissensgeschichte als Gesellschaftsgeschichte*; Konrad Köstlin, "Archive, Materialien und Projekte: Wissensproduktion und disziplinäres Selbstverständnis," in *Volkskundliche Grossprojekte: Ihre Geschichte und Zukunft*, ed. Christoph Schmitt (Münster: Waxmann, 2005), 15–31.

410 Anthropologists frequently associated with the anthropology of knowledge include Mary Douglas, (UK), Fredrik Barth (Norway/US), Clifford Geertz (US), Paul Rabinow (US), James D. Faubion (US), and Dominic Boyer (US). For an outline of the history and present state of the field of history and sociology of science, see the chapter "Study Frameworks" in the present work.

of knowledge produced by researchers . . . always taking into account not only the situation of the researchers (including social background, physical location, and political views) and its effects on research aims and methods, but also the manner in which research is processed and presented." Echoing the standard sociological / anthropological assumption articulated by Berger and Luckmann in the 1960s,[411] Bausinger continues: "The turn to subjectivity has its epistemological counterpart in the conviction that we are not confronted with and part of *the* objective reality, but that reality is always a construction."[412] In this sense, the contemporary turn toward historiography of *Volkskunde* as history of science may be understood as the latest iteration of the *Folklorismus* debate that problematized how *Volkskundler* help to "create" folk culture for themselves and the public.

Critical reflection is being directed not just at *Volkskunde*'s production of cultural knowledge, however, but at the field's own historiography, as well.[413] Critiques of the field's historical identity performances recollect the corpus of institutional memory narratives in terms of the history and sociology of science, but they also grapple with how one might pursue such research using the defining method of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie*: ethnography.[414] This methodological concern has an ethical counterpart, as it redirects to the question of researcher reflexivity, reinforcing an ethic not only of

---

411 Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966).

412 Hermann Bausinger, "More Flexibility," *Journal of Folklore Research* 47, no. 1/2 (2010): 202–203.

413 See, for instance, Brigitte Bönisch-Brednich, "Von der Individualforschung zur institutionalisierten Wissenschaft: Das Beispiel Schlesien," in *Alltagskulturen zwischen Erinnerung und Geschichte: Beiträge zur Volkskunde der Deutschen im und aus dem östlichen Europa*, ed. Kurt Dröge (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1995), 183–95; Deißner, "Zur Geschichte volkskundlicher Fachgeschichtsschreibung bis 1931"; Petr Lozoviuk and Johannes Moser, eds., *Probleme und Perspektiven der volkskundlich-kulturwissenschaftlichen Fachgeschichtsschreibung. Versammelt die überarbeiteten Vorträge eines Arbeitstreffens, das am 26. und 27. November 2004 in Dresden unter dem Titel "Perspektiven und Probleme der ethnologischen Fachgeschichtsschreibung" veranstaltet hat* (Dresden: Thelem, 2005).

414 Mischek, "Fachgeschichte aus ethnologischer Perspektive"; Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*.

reflecting on how the researcher's interests and ideologies impact the study of culture in the present, but on past researchers' impact on the field's present form and identity. In other words, contemporary *Volkskundler* / *Europäische Ethnologen* are becoming cognizant of a phenomenon akin to institutional memory in this study's usage.

A poignant example of such critical historiography within contemporary *Volkskunde* is a 1999 talk by Bernhard Tschofen (then at the University of Vienna, now a professor at the EKW-Institute in Tübingen). Tschofen argues that there was insufficient transfer of reflexivity from the second wave of *Volkskunde*'s *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* into present disciplinary historiography (the third wave).[415] On the one hand, he acknowledges, "*European ethnology* as it is practiced in the German-speaking countries is said to be a highly reflexive discipline because its history weighs so heavily on its shoulders."[416] But, in a section of the article entitled "Reflexivity as Delusion," Tschofen warns that "reflecting on the discipline's own history leads one not only to new fields and niches—and of course to new scholarly authorities—but also to an intensive preoccupation with the past, above all with the Nazi-past of *Volkskunde*."

Thus borrowing a theme from author Martin Walser,[417] Tschofen laments that this preoccupation has led to the trivialization of research into Nazi-era *Volkskunde*.[418] But unlike Walser, who recommended that Germany move on from its Nazi past, lest its memorializations of the regime's victims become empty ritual, Tschofen advocates continuing *Volkskunde* historiography in a new frame: moving on from writing stories of

---

[415] "It is a tragedy in its own right," he says, "that after Hermann Bausinger's initial 1965 article and a few other highly reflexive contributions (Gerndt 1987; Jeggle 1988), the high standards of recent European ethnology apparently do not carry over into the writing of the disciplines own history." Bernhard Tschofen, "The Habit of Folklore: Remarks on Lived Volkskunde and the Everyday Practice of European Ethnology after the End of Faith," *Journal of Folklore Research* 36, no. 2/3 (1999): 239.
[416] Ibid., 236.
[417] Walser, *Ansprachen aus Anlaß der Verleihung des Friedenspreises*.
[418] Tschofen, "The Habit of Folklore," 239.

corrupted or co-opted *Volkskundler* to writing "a history of science as a cultural practice—an analysis of the representations of ethnographic knowledge and their influence on everyday images of folklore."[419] As it happened, this reflexive turn has been imprinted in institutional memory in more ways than one.

Recalling Wolfgang Kaschuba's 1994 articulation of the field's *Aufgabe* in the context of new public interest in culture—be it the revival of folk culture, as Tschofen considers, or anxiety about multiculturalism, as Kaschuba discusses—the need for reflexivity concerning anthropological knowledge-production is both timely and pressing. This reflexivity is not just directed toward the community and cultural phenomena that are the objects of ethnographic research, but concerns the field's impact in the public sphere. The self-critical historiographic reflexivity initiated in the 1960s must therefore not become installed simply as a stable origin myth, but must continue to be translated into contemporary disciplinary practice—installed in the field's epistemic structure, or its *habitus* (in Bourdieu's sense), as Tschofen proposes.[420]

In doing precisely this, self-reflection about the conditions and implications of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie*'s past and present knowledge-production is now more than a commonplace. It is a prerequisite ethical practice for every ethnographic undertaking.[421] One might read this turn as a further sign of German *Volkskunde*'s normalization, as it dovetails with similar transformations in Anglophone and Francophone cultural anthropology in dealing with their own traditions' colonial past. But, as demonstrated in this chapter, for *Volkskunde* in Germany, reflexivity is also a translation of a nationally specific *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, the overcoming of Nazi

[419] Ibid.
[420] Ibid., 241.
[421] This claim was recently reiterated in Schmidt-Lauber, "Seeing, Hearing, Feeling, Writing: Approaches and Methods from the Perspective of Ethnological Analysis of the Present," 559.

involvements—further evidencing German *Volkskunde*'s *Sonderweg* in the field of international anthropology. In that sense, one might also consider this latest translation if the *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* trope as a kind of institutional postmemory—no longer directly indexing the Nazi period, but carrying the structural implications thereof into the present context and mission of the field.

But now, as the expanded scope of critical historiographic research called for in the 1980s is being actualized in the twenty-first century, disciplinary self-reflection has come to encompass the deeper implications of *Volkskunde*'s knowledge-production, not just for the rise of German racial / cultural imperialism, but as one national (albeit extreme) case study of the effects and ethics of anthropological knowledge-production. The field's integration into the story of cultural anthropology more generally reiterates Gottfried Korff's 1996 suggestion that *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* is no longer that "strange, peculiarly German science" of which Thomas Nipperdey spoke, but rather, as Brigitta Schmidt-Lauber more recently translated the historian's notorious quote, a "disciplinary specificity of the German-speaking countries."[422]

In this latest translation of the *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* trope, not only is the *Sonderweg* notion positively valued; it is even being extrapolated to the European ethnological community. In the view of Reinhard Johler, every ethnological tradition of

---

[422] Schmidt-Lauber quotes Thomas Nipperdey, *Deutsche Geschichte 1800–1866: Bürgerwelt und starker Staat* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1983), 522. The full sentence from Nipperdey's 1983 original reads: "[Wilhelm Riehls] Forschungen und Werke sind der Beginn der merkwürdigen deutschen Sonderdisziplin einer sozialwissenschaftlichen Ethnologie, der deutschen Volkskunde." In her citation, however, Schmidt-Lauber does not include reference to the adjective "merkwürdig," but rather focuses on the phrase denoting *Volkskunde* as a "disciplinary specificity of the German-speaking countries—a 'German special discipline.'" Schmidt-Lauber, "Seeing, Hearing, Feeling, Writing: Approaches and Methods from the Perspective of Ethnological Analysis of the Present," 559. At this point it is interesting to note how the progress of *Volkskunde*'s normalization is even captured in the difference in translations among Korff's, Schmidt-Lauber's, and Johler's quotations of the Nipperdey phrase, and particularly the adjective "merkwürdig." Where Korff (1996, 403) translates the word as "strange," Johler (2012, 247) opts for "curious," and Schmidt-Lauber (2012, 559) leaves out that word completely.

Europe can be understood as having developed along its own "special path." What is more, argues Johler, the diverse European traditions are now all beginning to tread a common European disciplinary *Sonderweg* within the international anthropological sphere.[423] In the context of global anthropology, then, German *Volkskunde*'s *Sonderweg* is being translated in institutional memory from a mark of abnormally developing nationalist science to a normalized status, aligned with the ethical standards of international cultural anthropology but also potentially indicating a common ethnological community of Europe in which German *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* can be a leading international contributor.

SUMMARY

In this chapter, we have seen the latest translations of the trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in the institutional memory of Germany's *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie*. Tension among the different branches of the "*Vielnamenfach*"—the structural legacy of the field's revolution in the context of West Germany's 1968—could still be felt in the historiographic treatment of the Nazi period in the 1980s and 1990s. By the late 1990s, however, that third wave of disciplinary dealings with its National Socialist involvements was entering a period of normalization in step with reunified German society, but also in Kuhn's sense of "normal science." This is not to say that the Nazi period was being bracketed off in institutional memory as something past and "overcome," but rather that *Vergangenheitbewältigung* was translated into a positive characteristic of the field: an ethic of present and historical researcher reflexivity in line with trends in international anthropology, but positing Germany's *Volkskunde* as a

[423] Reinhard Johler, "Doing European Ethnology in a Time of Change: The Metamorphosis of a Discipline (in Germany and Europe)," *Traditiones* 41, no. 2 (2012): 252.

special case—a *Sonderweg*?—of dealing with the common problem of the implications of anthropological knowledge-production.

The trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* is unquestionably a central force in the transformation of Germany's *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* from 1945 to the present. But it is not the only narrative trope that inheres in the field's institutional memory. The emergent state of normalcy is not only a final translation of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, an entry into a postmemorial state of institutional memory vis-à-vis National Socialism. It is also a space for the uncovering of other tropes of institutional memory that had been until recently buried under the rubble of that particular disciplinary rupture.

Parts II and III therefore examine an additional, underarticulated trope of the field's institutional memory, that of boundary-construction, -maintenance, and -traversal. We have seen in Part I how the boundary between a scientific field and the public (including state ideology) became a foundational trope of institutional memory. Part II will consider that same boundary, but for the case of East German *Volkskunde*. But it also will begin to amplify two additional boundaries that then will be explicitly addressed together in the Part III. These are the boundaries between different scientific fields, namely, neighboring disciplines and other national branches of cultural anthropology. Together, Parts I, II, and III will ultimately reveal how the institutional memory of postwar German *Volkskunde* can and should not be understood as only or primarily the product of dealing with the field's participation in the Nazi regime. While it is undoubtedly a unique case in the history of cultural anthropology, this dissertation ultimately demonstrates how the overarching trope of boundary construction and maintenance is central to the identity and development of any scientific field—an insight

with implications for the very definition of scientific fields and methodological frameworks of the history and sociology of science.

PART II:

EAST GERMAN *VOLKSKUNDE* AS A CASE OF INSTITUTIONAL MEMORY, AMNESIA, AND MEMORY CONTESTS

Part I examined translations of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, which has been both the most prominent trope of the historiography of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* and, as this study argues, a paradigmatic example of the functioning of institutional memory. Examples highlighted there reveal how narratives concerning the field's past under Nazism informed structural shifts, both organizational and epistemic. These include a shift in the identifying disciplinary focus entailing not only largely abandoning local theorizing in favor of rigorous methodology, but an epistemic and organizational splintering in the 1960s/70s along ideological lines strongly mirroring broader public and political reactions to the imprint of Nazi fascism on contemporary culture. Those internal fissures have been translated into a variety of institutional profiles, with a narrative positing the field as a "*Vielnamenfach*," united by a common past and characterized by a present diversity that grew out of its postwar identity struggles. Chapter 3 concluded by discussing indications of normalization in the last two decades, as members of this scientific community have begun developing new theoretical models for considering emergent cultural phenomena within their sphere of research and as some individuals and

collectives begin exploring other aspects of the field's past beyond the Nazi era now under the auspices of history of sciences as a legitimate—as opposed to legitimating—subdisciplinary practice.

In probing the trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in the institutional memory of West- and reunified German *Volkskunde*, the analysis necessarily considered how the field's relation to neighboring disciplines comprising Germany's scientific community, on the one hand, and other national traditions of cultural anthropology, on the other, are two structural issues that arise time and again. As such, the boundaries between fields are both a constant concern and a frequently invoked marker of disciplinary identity. While discursive and structural transformations concerning the field's external boundaries frequently manifests with reference to overcoming the Nazi past, the analyses comprising the remainder of this study reveal how the question of interfield boundaries is being unearthed from that historical rubble to take a place as a trope of institutional memory unto itself. That is, Parts II and III consider alternatives to the trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* that until recently has dominated the field's self-understanding.

The discussion to this point has focused on how two significant turning points in West German institutional memory—the immediate postwar institutional recovery and the political revolution surrounding 1968—have been translated across disciplinary historiography, culminating in indications that the field is moving toward a state of normalization much in step with German public discourse. The two chapters comprising Part II are dedicated to the institutional memory—or better, the institutional amnesia, memory contests, and even emerging postmemory—surrounding East German *Volkskunde*. This analysis will reveal not only how disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* was still a pressing matter for the field that proceeded in

conversation with public discourse, but how the Communist state's intervention and the bridging of the field with the Soviet model of *Ethnographie* created a situation that is a reversal of the pattern of institutional memory in the West German case.

In contrast to how disciplinary historiography affected the structuring of *Volkskunde* in the Federal Republic—seen especially poignantly in the case of the field's "1968" revolution—both the epistemic and organizational structures and the identity narratives of GDR *Volkskunde* were circumscribed by state ideology. This is evidenced by the manifestation of key concepts of Socialist state-planning and culture—"*Aufbau*" (building-up), antifascism, the people's democracy, etc.—across East German *Volkskunde*'s own historiography. Moreover, during their forty-year separation, each nation's tradition was sequestered in the historiography of the other, further reinforcing the remarkable fracturedness of *Volkskunde*'s postwar institutional memory, this time along the emblematic political boundary of the Cold War period. As the structures of GDR *Volkskunde* abruptly disappeared with the fall of communism in Europe, the analysis will reveal how that branch of the field—much like the GDR itself in public memory—was a case of institutional amnesia, memory contests, and emerging postmemory.

The problems of historiography, memory, and national identity associated with the dissolution of East Germany in 1989/90 have become a subfield of interdisciplinary, international German studies unto itself. By now GDR studies has developed a set of recognizable historiographic tropes, which, as will be demonstrated, also work to structure the institutional memory of East German *Volkskunde*. Among the most prominent of these is dictatorship, including comparisons to the National Socialist

regime.[424] Closely related to this is the trope of the fraught relationship between the individual, society, and the state.[425] These first two tropes are furthermore repeated in histories of the relationship between science and the East German state,[426] as well as of the role of East German authors and intellectuals during and after the Cold War.[427] Dual, divided, or contested German history,[428] memory,[429] and identity[430] is a third major trope,

---

[424] Jürgen Kocka, *Civil Society and Dictatorship in Modern German History*, The Menahem Stern Jerusalem Lectures (Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 2010); Corey Ross, *The East German Dictatorship: Problems and Perspectives in the Interpretation of the GDR* (London: Arnold, 2002); Peter C. Caldwell, *Dictatorship, State Planning, and Social Theory in the German Democratic Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Mary Fulbrook, *Anatomy of a Dictatorship: Inside the GDR, 1949–1989* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Anne Martin et al., *Einsichten: Diktatur und Widerstand in der DDR* (Leipzig: Reclam, 2001); Hermann Weber, *Aufbau und Fall einer Diktatur: Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte der DDR* (Cologne: Bund-Verlag, 1991); Wolfgang Welsch, *Die verklärte Diktatur: Der verdrängte Widerstand gegen den SED-Staat* (Aachen: Helios, 2009); Katja Schweizer, *Täter und Opfer in der DDR: Vergangenheitsbewältigung nach der zweiten deutschen Diktatur* (Münster: LIT, 1999).

[425] Mary Fulbrook, *The People's State: East German Society from Hitler to Honecker* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2005); Thomas Lindenberger, *Herrschaft und Eigen-Sinn in der Diktatur: Studien zur Gesellschaftsgeschichte der DDR* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1999); Richard Bessel and Ralph Jessen, eds., *Die Grenzen der Diktatur: Staat und Gesellschaft in der DDR* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996); Katherine Pence and Paul Betts, *Socialist Modern: East German Everyday Culture and Politics* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2008).

[426] Martin Sabrow and Peter T. Walther, *Historische Forschung und sozialistische Diktatur: Beiträge zur Geschichtswissenschaft der DDR* (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 1995); Martin Sabrow, ed., *Verwaltete Vergangenheit: Geschichtskultur und Herrschaftslegitimation in der DDR* (Leipzig: Akademische Verlagsanstalt, 1997); Martin Sabrow, *Das Diktat des Konsenses: Geschichtswissenschaft in der DDR 1949–1969* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2001); John Connelly and Michael Grüttner, *Universities under Dictatorship* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005); John Connelly, "Humboldt Coopted: East German Universities, 1945–1989," in *German Universities, Past and Future: Crisis or Renewal?*, ed. Mitchell G. Ash (Oxford: Berghahn, 1997), 55–76; Ash, "Wissenschaft und Politik als Ressourcen für einander."

[427] Andreas Huyssen, "After the Wall: The Failure of German Intellectuals," *New German Critique* 52 (1991): 109–43; Andreas Huyssen, "The Inevitability of Nation: German Intellectuals after Unification," *October* 61 (1992): 65–73; Jan-Werner Müller, *Another Country: German Intellectuals, Unification and National Identity* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2000); Volker Wehdeking, *Die deutsche Einheit und die Schriftsteller: Literarische Verarbeitung der Wende seit 1989* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1995); Stephen Brockmann, *Literature and German Reunification*, Cambridge Studies in German (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Arthur Williams, K. Stuart Parkes, and Roland Smith, eds., *German Literature at a Time of Change 1989–1990: German Unity and German Identity in Literary Perspective* (New York: P. Lang, 1991); Boyer, *Spirit and System*.

[428] Christoph Klessmann, *The Divided Past: Rewriting Post-War German History* (New York: Berg, 2001); Christoph Klessmann, *Die doppelte Staatsgründung: Deutsche Geschichte 1945–1955* (Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, 1986); Christoph Klessmann, *Zwei Staaten, eine Nation: Deutsche Geschichte 1955-1970* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988); Mary Fulbrook, *The Divided Nation: A History of Germany, 1918-1990* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Mary Fulbrook, *The Two*

under which can be included the problem of German *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* as both divided regarding World War II, and repeated after the fall of the Berlin Wall.[431] But increasingly the division implied in this trope is not longer between East and West German states imagined as monocultures, but rather a plural and ambiguous memory, made all the more so by generational difference.[432] Finally, notions about the impermeability of the boundary between East and West are being challenged with new studies of transnational tactic in a variety of fields, from popular media to high art.[433]

In the following two chapters, it will be shown how these interpretive tropes manifest also in the institutional memory of East Germany's *Volkskunde*, both during and following the "*Wende*." Chapter 4 considers institutional memory of East German *Volkskunde* during that state's existence, in both East and West German disciplinary

---

Germanies, 1945-1990: Problems of Interpretation, Studies in European History (Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan, 1992); Tobias Hochscherf, *Divided, But Not Disconnected: German Experiences of the Cold War* (New York: Berghahn, 2013); Christhard Hoffmann, "One Nation—Which Past? Historiography and German Identities in the 1990s," *German Politics and Society* 43 (1997): 1–7.

[429] Fuchs, Cosgrove, and Grote, *German Memory Contests*; Peter März, Hans-Joachim Veen, and Markus Pieper, eds., *Woran erinnern?: Der Kommunismus in der deutschen Erinnerungskultur* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2006); Renate Rechtien and Dennis Tate, eds., *Twenty Years On: Competing Memories of the GDR in Postunification German Culture*, Studies in German Literature Linguistics and Culture, 110 (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2011).

[430] Silke Arnold-de Simine, ed., *Memory Traces: 1989 and the Question of German Cultural Identity* (Oxford: P. Lang, 2005); Fuchs, James-Chakraborty, and Shortt, *Debating German Cultural Identity since 1989*; Nick Hodgin and Caroline Pearce, eds., *The GDR Remembered: Representations of the East German State since 1989*, Studies in German Literature Linguistics and Culture 106 (Rochester, N.Y.: Boydell & Brewer, 2011); Marc Silberman, *What Remains?: East German Culture and the Postwar Public* (Washington, D.C.: American Institute for Contemporary German Studies, 1997).

[431] Thomas C. Fox, *Stated Memory: East Germany and the Holocaust*, Studies in German Literature, Linguistics, and Culture (Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 1999); Herf, *Divided Memory*, 1997.

[432] Leslie A. Adelson, ed., *The Cultural After-Life of East Germany: New Transnational Perspectives*, Helen & Harry Gray Humanities Program Series (Washington, D.C.: American Institute for Contemporary German Studies, 2002); Pamela Heß, *Geschichte als Politikum: Öffentliche und private Kontroversen um die Deutung der DDR-Vergangenheit* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2014).

[433] April Eisman, "East German Art and the Permeability of the Berlin Wall," *German Studies Review* 38, no. 2 (2015): forthcoming; Marc Silberman and Henning Wrage, *DEFA at the Crossroads of East German and International Film Culture: A Companion*, 2014; Henning Wrage, *Die Zeit der Kunst. Literatur, Film und Fernsehen in der DDR der 1960er Jahre: Eine Kulturgeschichte in Beispielen* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2008).

historiography. Chapter 5 then turns to the challenge that East German *Volkskunde*—its state-directed existence and sudden structural erasure—poses to the field's institutional memory after 1989/90. As in the case study presented in Part I, Part II's analysis reveals clearly how disciplinary and public discourses interact for the field's self-construction. However, in the East German case, the nature of the narrative-structure symbiosis is different because both public and scientific structures and discourses are circumscribed by the state. In these ways, Part II will begin to reveal how the issue of boundaries, constructed and breached, might be read as a latent trope of German *Volkskunde*'s institutional memory.

Chapter 4 will present various perspectives on the disciplinary historiography of GDR *Volkskunde* from its establishment in the Soviet Occupied Zone up to German national reunification in 1989/90. The fate of East German *Volkskunde* following reunification will then be examined as a poignant case study in institutional forgetting and institutional memory contests in Chapter 5.[434] Part II cannot offer a comprehensive treatment of GDR *Volkskunde*'s historiography. Rather, it provides a survey of exemplar texts that represent trends in the discourse, with references to further sources in the footnotes. This study does not wish to give short shrift to this important topic. Indeed, the cursory treatment GDR *Volkskunde* has received until recently is worthy of criticism. Within the scope of this dissertation, however, the intention is not to completely fill that gap, but to outline themes and assemble sources for further research that could contribute to the new wave of transnational, critical GDR studies more broadly.

[434] For recent research on the issue of competing or contested memories of the GDR, see, for instance, Heß, *Geschichte als Politikum: Öffentliche und private Kontroversen um die Deutung der DDR-Vergangenheit*; Fuchs, Cosgrove, and Grote, *German Memory Contests*; Anna Saunders and Debbie Pinfold, eds., *Remembering and Rethinking the GDR: Multiple Perspectives and Plural Authenticities*, Palgrave Macmillan Memory Studies (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); Rechtien and Tate, *Twenty Years On*.

Chapter 4:

Institutional Memory in and of East German *Volkskunde*, 1945–1989

Germany's forty-year division into two states after World War II was mirrored in the division of the sciences along the imagined and physical political boundary between capitalist and communist worldviews. For *Volkskunde* in the Soviet Occupied Zone, which in 1949 would become the German Democratic Republic (GDR, East Germany), this change of government meant not only the eventual reduction of the field's institutional presence to one, main government-sponsored research hub, Berlin,[435] but the additional pressure to prove the field's value to an increasingly restrictive single-party government. While the Nazi past was a hurdle to overcome for reestablishing *Volkskunde*'s legitimacy, publicly and among the sciences, in both West and East

[435] Teresa Brinkel, in her recent history of GDR *Volkskunde*, describes the institutional makeup of the field thus: In Berlin, three bodies managed the production and dissemination of *Volkskunde* research: the *Volkskunde* institutes of the Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin (AdW) established in 1946 in the Soviet Occupied Zone; the *Volkskunde* institute at the Humboldt University; and the Museum für Volkskunde. Other smaller research institutes included the Dresden branch of the AdW *Volkskunde* divisions, the Wossidlo research center in Rostock, the Institut für Volkskunde at the Karl Marx University of Leipzig, and the Institut für sorbische Kulturforschung in Bautzen, as well as numerous *Volkskunde* museums and local *Volkskultur* preservation groups that served as sites for building up a new national-cultural identity grounded in peasant / workers' culture. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, several of the institutes were reorganized and renamed to reflect the field's largely state-directed realignment with *Ethnographie* (following the Soviet model of non-Europeanist and Europeanist cultural anthropology in one) on the one hand, and historical science on the other. Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*, 11; 39–58; 104–107.

Germany, by aligning with the GDR's foundation myth of antifascism and the state project of building a socialist society, East German *Volkskunde* quickly loosed itself of its National Socialist baggage.

Thus, where *Volkskunde* in the Federal Republic underwent a fifteen-year period of avoiding facing the field's politicization under Nazism, East German *Volkskunde*'s engagement suggests a case of complete institutional forgetting, or better, repressed memory of the years 1933–1945. As a former East German *Volkskundlerin*, Ute Mohrmann, reflected in 1991, "Im Fach war der 'Erinnerungsberg' der Auseinandersetzung mit dem faschistischen Gestern noch nicht abgetragen, als es um die Konzepte für das Kommende ging."[436] The possibility of extended avoidance of the Nazi past resonates strongly with larger patterns of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, or the lack thereof, in East Germany. Once the official process of denazification in the Occupied Zones was concluded and Germany was divided into separate states, a theory of Marxist-Leninist antifascism took hold in the East. The historian Jürgen Kocka explains, "According to this view German fascism had largely been a plot, an instrument, the responsibility of capitalist and military elites, while the people at large had been partly

[436] "In the field, the 'mountain of memory' dealing with the fascist past was not yet excavated when the focus became what was to come." Ute Mohrmann, "Die 'Volkskunde des Neubeginns' während der fünfziger Jahre in der DDR im Kontext damaliger Kulturpolitik," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 87 (1991a): 196. The sentiment introduces Mohrmann's essay. She goes on to quote Bertolt Brecht's characterization of the situation for East Germany as a whole: "Es ist ein großes Unglück unserer Geschichte, daß wir den Aufbau des Neuen leisten müssen, ohne die Niederreißung des Alten geleistet zu haben." Bertolt Brecht, *Schriften zum Theater*, vol. 6 (Berlin: Suhrkamp, 1964), 330. The Brecht quote would reappear in Teresa Brinkel's 2013 history of GDR *Volkskunde* to introduce the story of the foundation period 1945–1961, establishing clearly that the field in both East and West faced the same problem of delegitimation. Brinkel notes further that *Volkskundler* on both sides of the new political divide were not prepared to begin coping with that past in the 1950s and into the 1960s. But where some West German *Volkskundler* began the process of rigorous disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in the 1960s, those in East Germany followed the pattern described by Brecht, largely bypassing critical reflection about the Nazi period and instead joining in the state project of socialist *Aufbau*. Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*, 39–42.

seduced and partly repressed victims, not really responsible."[437] Through this ideology, the GDR was posited as having "removed the structural conditions of fascism, while the same elites and the old structures were said to be still alive and powerful in the Federal Republic."[438] This was the founding myth of the GDR, and also a basis of Cold War conflict in the German-German case.

But while *Volkskundler* in East Germany would have to align their work with government mandates and Marxist-Leninist models of culture, this is not to suggest that there was never any resistance to state control over the field, including the field's effacing of its past in National Socialism. Even one of the founding figures, Wolfgang Steinitz, though a committed socialist himself and active participant in SED[439] party politics, desired a loosening of the bond between politics and science in the GDR, to no avail. As for the lack of disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, eschewing engagement with Nazi-era *Volkskunde* was not simply a matter of scholars subscribing to the national founding myth of antifascism, but was precluded further in the 1960s—when factions of West German *Volkskundler* began actively exorcising that past—because criticism of the field's sordid Nazi entanglements would necessitate criticism of early and present GDR *Volkskunde* as a state enterprise, as well.[440] It was not until the late 1980s and 1990s that certain GDR *Volkskundler* began working on the topic of the discipline under Nazism and GDR *Volkskundler*'s unique engagement / avoidance of the topic. But then this was

---

[437] Kocka, *Civil Society and Dictatorship in Modern German History*, 74.
[438] Ibid.
[439] The Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands (Socialist Unity Part of Germany), the governing political party of the German Democratic Republic.
[440] On this point, see Matthias Kehl, "Zur Etablierung der marxistisch-leninistischen Volkskunde am Zentralinstitut für Geschichte," in *Historische Forschung und sozialistische Diktatur: Beiträge zur Geschichtswissenschaft der DDR*, ed. Martin Sabrow and Peter Walther (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 1995), 244–65.

in collaboration with West German *Volkskundler* already beginning their third wave of disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*.[441]

Rather than framing East German *Volkskunde*'s patterns of postwar self-presentation in terms of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, it is more sensible—and in fact more typical in recent historiography—to observe how disciplinary discourse mirrors the political-generational discourse of the GDR, beginning with *Aufbau*—the building up of a socialist society—and the era of *Ankunft* (arrival), wherein professional researchers were encouraged to work in a democratizing fashion that included *Volksgemeinschaften* (local amateur folklore groups) in the production of cultural knowledge.[442] The 1960s witnessed emerging criticism of the Marxist-Leninist model of culture among certain camps of *Volkskundler*. This trend coincided with a period of amplifying political control across East German society, which, for the sciences, culminated in the 1967/68 reforms of higher education and research institutions (*Hochschul- und Akademiereform*). However, there were also intermittent loosening of political structures—for instance in the area of international travel permissions—that became more frequent following SED Party Secretary Erich Honecker's[443] ascent to power in the 1970s. In consequence, it can be said that, from its beginning, the field of GDR *Volkskunde* had always to navigate the faint boundary with state ideology, with or without the political commitment of its practitioners themselves.

---

441 See, for instance, Dow and Lixfeld, *The Nazification of an Academic Discipline*; Jacobeit, Lixfeld, and Bockhorn, *Völkische Wissenschaft*; Lixfeld, *Folklore and Fascism*.

442 This framework for analysis is often applied to the field of GDR literature, beginning with the so-called Bitterfelder Weg that established authors' role in forwarding the socialist state ideology. See, for instance, Wolfgang Emmerich, *Kleine Literaturgeschichte der DDR*, 4. erweiterte Neuausgabe (Berlin: Aufbau, 2009).

443 Honecker served as leader of the SED from 1971 until 1989, the eve of communism's collapse in Europe. His tenure was marked by economic stability and a less antagonistic policy toward the West, compared to that of his predecessor, Walter Ulbricht.

With the "*Wende*"—the "turning point" that led to German-German state reunification in 1990—GDR *Volkskunde*, much like the GDR itself, would quickly become relegated to the margins of institutional memory. Disciplinary historiography published between 1991 and today is sparse and, for the most part, about ten years delayed. However, the explosion of historiography surrounding GDR *Volkskunde* since 2000 reveals an active desire on the part of the first generation founders and the second generation, their students, as well as a "third generation" of *Volkskundler* / *Europäische Ethnologen* and historians—those who were children in the GDR or during the German-German state separation, but have no adult memory of it—to begin excavating the critical elements of GDR *Volkskunde* so long suppressed by state control over the field's historiographic self-construction.

The present chapter proceeds roughly chronologically as it considers historiographic articulations regarding GDR *Volkskunde* from three perspectives. First, it examines the institutional memory of *Volkskunde* formed in East Germany, which, as discussed above, tends to emblemize the field's integration in the political discourse and governmental structures of the GDR. Second, it considers how East German *Volkskunde* was represented within the scope of West German disciplinary historiography, and vice versa, with patterns of appearance and effacement that reflect the existing, though tenuous connections between East and West. Third, the chapter explores how East German *Volkskunde* was perceived by and presented to international anthropological communities beyond East and West Germany. In combination, the second and third perspectives reveal another layer of boundary issues beyond typical questions concerning science and the state, namely international and interdisciplinary relations. The succeeding chapter will then consider the challenges surrounding the incorporation of East German *Volkskunde* into a common institutional memory after the fall of the Wall.

FOUNDING MYTHS AND SCIENTIFIC-POLITICAL *AUFGABEN*

The adaptation to the ideological needs of the new socialist state yielded a new framing of *Volkskunde*'s historical and present work as revolutionary, democratic, and oriented toward workers' culture (as opposed to the emphasis on peasant culture up to and through the National Socialist era) as the essence of the *Volk*, past and present, the applied study of which was deemed necessary for establishing a national consciousness for the GDR.[444] For this reason, East German *Volkskunde*'s presentation of its history and its *Aufgaben* would emphasize how the study of workers' culture benefitted the building of a socialist Germany. This necessary postwar identity performance shared some elements with the narratives put forth by certain camps of West German *Volkskunde*. For example, Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl was posited as a socially critical, politically engaged figure who initiated the academic establishment of *Volkskunde* as an independent, politically useful, yet expert scholarly field.[445] Hans Naumann was denounced as a key contributor to National Socialist ideology with his co-opted notions of cultural *Oberschicht* and *Unterschicht*.[446] And workers' culture, as opposed to peasant culture, became a new field of research for some more radical West German institutes that

---

[444] John Connelly notes that soon after the SED formed in 1946, the party "began concocting an identity for its subjects from the 'progressive' legacies of German history." In this beginning, Goethe and Marx were among the historical figures held up as models. Wilhelm von Humboldt was also invoked for the purpose of establishing a story of continuity in higher education, however critics are skeptical about how well the SED followed Humboldt's notion of *Bildung* as the freedom to study, considering the high level of state intervention in the universities. Connelly, "Humboldt Coopted: East German Universities, 1945–1989," 55–56.

[445] While West German *Volkskundler* acknowledged the problematic nature of Riehl's political engagement in light of the field's fascist entanglements, East German *Volkskundler* Wolfgang Steinitz posited Riehl as a revolutionary figure who opposed the bourgeois co-option of the nascent scientific discipline. Compare, for instance, Moser, "Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl und die Volkskunde"; Wolfgang Steinitz, *Die volkskundliche Arbeit in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik: Vortrag, gehalten auf der Volkskunde-Tagung der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin vom 4. bis 6. September 1953*, ed. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin-Ost) (Leipzig: Zentralhaus für Laienkunst, 1953).

[446] See Naumann, *Deutsche Volkskunde*; Hans Naumann and Ida Blum Naumann, *Primitive Gemeinschaftskultur: Beiträge zur Volkskunde und Mythologie* (Jena: E. Diederichs, 1921).

maintained contact with some East German *Volkskundler* throughout the period of German state division.

Foundation stories of GDR *Volkskunde* typically begin with Adolf Spamer. Already prominent in the field prior to the rise of Nazism, Spamer was installed by the National Socialist government as chair of *Volkskunde* at the Friedrich-Wilhelms University of Berlin in 1936. Despite this dubious honor, Spamer came to lead the initiative to restore the field in the Soviet Occupied Zone beginning immediately after war's end. He succeeded in establishing two *Volkskunde* institutes, in Berlin and Dresden, which were soon united under the auspices of the Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin (German Academy of Sciences, hereafter AdW) Commission for *Volkskunde*, which Spamer led until his death.[447] His tenure was short lived, however; in 1953 Adolf Spamer died of an extended illness that most historiography traces to the stresses of working under the pressure and persecution of the National Socialist regime.[448]

Spamer was not a NSDAP member and would never be accused of being a Nazi ideologue. Yet his work under Nazi oversight would be thematized time and again across the postwar historiography of *Volkskunde*, often in a spirit of defense and laudation, but more typically floating in the sphere of ambiguity.[449] When it came to establishing a

---

[447] In a brief history of the Berlin Institut für Volkskunde included in a volume covering the first ten years of the AdW, Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann proposes that the institute's history began already in 1938 when Spamer (her teacher) was voted into the Preußische Akademie der Wissenschaften, the predecessor to the AdW. Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, "Zehn Jahre Institut für deutsche Volkskunde," in *Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin 1946–1956*, ed. Johannes Irmscher, Werner Radig, and Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956), 435–47.

[448] Steinitz, *Die volkskundliche Arbeit in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, 13–14; Jacobeit, "Auseinandersetzung mit der NS-Zeit in der DDR-Volkskunde," 303; Weber-Kellermann, *Deutsche Volkskunde zwischen Germanistik und Sozialwissenschaften*, 79.

[449] See Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, "Adolf Spamer zum Gedächtnis: 10. April 1883 bis 20. Juni 1953," *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde*, 1953, 219–25; Manfred Bachmann, "Adolf Spamer: Ein Leben für die deutsche Volkskunde," in *Deutsche Volkskunst* (Staatliche Kommission für Kunstangelegenheiten, 1952), 25–27; Thomas Scholze, "Adolf Spamer (1883–1953)—Wissenschaftsgrundsätze," in *Geschichte*

foundation story for GDR *Volkskunde* in the early years, however, Spamer's career would be cast quite unambiguously in the most positive light: as a leading figure already preceding the Nazi period, persecuted by Alfred Rosenberg's office of ideological surveillance[450] to the point of mental and physical breakdown, yet assembling sufficient strength to revitalize the field in the East following the end of the war. This is the picture painted by Wolfgang Steinitz[451]—a committed communist, eventual SED party member,[452] and Spamer's successor at the AdW—in his address to the Academy's Deutsche Volkskunde und Völkerkunde division at its 1953 conference,[453] less than three months after Spamer's passing that June.[454]

---

der Völkerkunde und Volkskunde an der Berliner Universität: Zur Aufarbeitung des Wissenschaftserbes, ed. Hannelore Bernhardt, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin 28 (Berlin: Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, 1991), 53–60; Strobach, "'. . . aber wann beginnt der Vorkrieg?' Anmerkungen zum Thema Volkskunde und Faschismus (vor und um 1933)"; Jacobeit, "Auseinandersetzung mit der NS-Zeit in der DDR-Volkskunde"; Lixfeld, *Folklore and Fascism*; Wolfgang Jacobeit, *Von West nach Ost und zurück: Autobiographisches eines Grenzgängers zwischen Tradition und Novation* (Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot, 2000); Weber-Kellermann, Becker, and Bimmer, *Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann*; Wolfgang Jacobeit and Ute Mohrmann, "Zur Geschichte der volkskundlichen Lehre unter Adolf Spamer an der Berliner Universität (1933–1945)," *Ethnographisch-archäologische Zeitschrift* 23 (1982): 283–98; Weber-Kellermann, "Zehn Jahre Institut für deutsche Volkskunde"; Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*, 43–52; Martin, *Aus dem Nachlaß Adolf Spamers*.

450 Known by several names—"Dienststelle Rosenberg," "Überwachungsamt Rosenberg," "Amt Rosenberg"—this was the office for the "Beauftragten des Führers für die Überwachung der gesamten geistigen und weltanschaulichen Erziehung der NSDAP."

451 Steinitz, *Die volkskundliche Arbeit in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, 13–14. For a list of biographical sources on Wolfgang Steinitz, see Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*, 53n31. See also Klaus Steinitz and Wolfgang Kaschuba, *Wolfgang Steinitz: Ich hatte unwahrscheinliches Glück. Ein Leben zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik* (Berlin: Dietz, 2006).

452 Ralph Jessen and John Connelly both note that a goal of the Soviet Occupiers and the SED after them was to purge academia of "bourgeois" academics, especially in the humanities. Thus, Steinitz's strong political ties to the Communist parties of Germany, both during World War II and after in the GDR, would be an important factor in his assumption of leadership in *Volkskunde*. Ralph Jessen, "Between Control and Collaboration: The University in East Germany," in *Universities under Dictatorship*, ed. John Connelly and Michael Grüttner (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005), 250; Connelly, "Humboldt Coopted: East German Universities, 1945–1989," 58.

453 The story Steinitz tells of Spamer's establishing *Volkskunde* for the GDR appears in a special section of the published lecture, and is treated together with Freiburg folksong researcher John Meier whose work was recognized by the GDR government.

454 His health failing, Spamer had asked Steinitz in 1951 to take over after his death. Spamer died onJune 20, 1953, three days after the East German *Volksaufstand* (people's uprising) and its quick and violent suppression by GDR and Soviet forces.

Steinitz's lecture would be remembered in subsequent historiography as a key articulation of the field's official scientific-political *Aufgaben*.[455] Reprinted in several scientific and popular publications, the talk positions *Volkskunde* as a "democratic" discipline whose scholarly production would not be held solely in the domain of the ivory tower or the culture ministry, but would be made accessible to all citizens. Steinitz situates Spamer's contribution to the field squarely within this message. Not only did Spamer resist capitulating to Nazi racist "*Pseudovolkskunde*" and thus was subject to persecution. Already during the Weimar period, Spamer also opposed Hans Naumann's theories of *gesunkener Kulturgut* and *primitiver Gemeinschaftsgut*, or what Steinitz refers to as the "*Herrenmenschenideologie*" (master-race ideology) that was taken up in Nazi cultural ideology. More importantly for the purposes of a lecture for an audience composed not only of fellow cultural researchers, but of government functionaries and popular folklore organizations, Steinitz describes Spamer as a progressive scholar who approached his work in historical *Volkskunde* not as a "*Schreibtischwissenschaft*"[456] but closely engaged with the present-day life of the people.[457]

The person of Adolf Spamer was only the most recent element in disciplinary history that Steinitz claimed as the worthy heritage of GDR *Volkskunde*. In a section

---

[455] See especially Kehl, "Zur Etablierung der marxistisch-leninistischen Volkskunde am Zentralinstitut für Geschichte."

[456] This term is akin to the English "armchair anthropology" used to mark a break between early British anthropologists who relied on missionary accounts to formulate their cultural theories, and those anthropologists who pursued long-term fieldwork themselves, a disciplinary founding myth typically identified as beginning with Bronislaw Malinowski (1884–1942). See Stocking, *After Tylor*. Steinitz's criticism may have a closer resonance to later anthropological self-critiques that took place in the 1970s and 80s, however, when some American anthropologists in particular began to think of their work in terms of "rapport" and later "complicity" with their interlocutors. On the development of this notion, see Marcus, *Ethnography Through Thick and Thin*, 105–131. Though on the surface both expressing an ethical reorientation toward alliance with the people among whom one conducts ethnographic fieldwork, Steinitz's perspective contrasts with that of later anthropologists in that his vision is of a politically engaged anthropology complicit with socialist ideology, as opposed to an ethic of siding with one's interlocutors even when they are opposed to the state.

[457] Steinitz, *Die volkskundliche Arbeit in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, 14.

dedicated to the history of the field in Germany, Steinitz outlines the major milestones for the field, beginning with the "social movements" of the Reformation and the Peasants' Wars of the early sixteenth century. Representative of *Volkskunde*'s revolutionary beginnings was the democratic, humanist scholar Johannes Bohemus (Böhm), who vehemently opposed the nobility's oppression of the peasants, and Sebastian Frank (lauded by Karl Marx, Steinitz notes) who likewise stood for the common man, regardless of ethnicity or national origin.[458]

Steinitz goes on to describe how *Volkskunde* began to materialize as a scientific discipline in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, when the young German bourgeoisie represented by Herder, Schiller, and Goethe, and later the German Romantics Arnim, Brentano, the Grimm brothers, and Karl Marx as well, took interest in German folk songs, poetry, and stories. According to Steinitz, these cultural products were the creations and property of the whole German *Volk*, not the bourgeois intellectuals—democratically minded though they were—who collected them.

At the same time, Steinitz notes, those national treasures that were the creations of the *Volk* were being assembled to confront French aggressions and form the basis for a German national consciousness.[459] In contrast to West German disciplinary historiographies, then, which saw Romanticism as the beginning of *Volkskunde*'s rise to independent scientific status, German nationalism was the beginning of the end for the field, according to Steinitz. Folk creations were effectively co-opted by the conservative aristocracy that divided and conquered the middle- and working-class factions in the March Revolution. Even Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl recognized the political abuse to which Germany's ruling classes were putting folk culture in the service of their specific

[458] Ibid., 7–12.
[459] Ibid., 9.

nationalist interests, Steinitz notes. The antidemocratic politicization of *Volkskunde* grew continually worse for the field, as Hans Naumann's theory took hold in the 1920s and was eventually assumed by the Nazi regime. Still, where 1933 was the year of *Volkskunde*'s ideological demise from the point of view of West German *Volkskundler*, in Steinitz's formulation, it was 1848 from the perspective of the GDR.[460]

Thus, East German *Volkskunde* would have to build upon a progressive tradition lost one hundred years before.[461] Steinitz concludes his talk with a discussion of the "*Aufgaben*" and central questions posed by *Volkskunde*. The two main tasks of the field would be, first, to study—and in the case of historical forms, to resurrect—the theretofore neglected body of progressive, democratic-liberal[462] traditions in German artistic folk creations. This practice would be based in Marxist-Leninist theory, but is not, Steinitz emphasizes, a strict political-ideological endeavor. Both Marxist and non-Marxist scholars could take part, though Marxist scholars could use *Volkskunde* research also as an opportunity to evangelize the benefits of historical-dialectical materialism. Second, academic *Volkskunde* must establish close connections with the cultural life of workers,

---

460 As Steinitz states: "Nach der Niederlage von 1848 verschwindet die demokratische Tendenz in der deutschen Volkskunde immer mehr." Ibid., 11. This chronology of the major breaking points in *Volkskunde*'s history from the point of view of the GDR would be reiterated in several entries of the first volume of the *Deutsches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* (1955). See especially the "Vorwort der Schriftleitung" (6–10) and the report on the 1953 AdW *Volkskunde* conference (260–268).

461 The invocation of the Romantic era would take place in the field of GDR literature in the 1970s, though on different ideological grounds, as authors drew parallels between the oppression of German workers in the Napoleonic Era and in the GDR. See, for instance, John David Pizer, *Imagining the Age of Goethe in German Literature, 1970–2010* (Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2011); Gareth Dale, *Popular Protest in East Germany* (New York: Routledge, 2006).

462 Steinitz clarifies his word choice, stating: "Wenn ich hier von den demokratisch-fortschrittlichen Traditionen des Volksschaffens gesprochen habe, so ist dies im engeren Sinne zu verstehen, als direkter, klar formulierter Ausdruck des sozialen Protestes gegen die herrschenden Klassen und ihre Unterdrückung. Im weiteren Sinne trägt ja das künstlerische Volksschaffen überhaupt, mit seinen schönen Trachten, Tänzen, Liedern usw. einen demokratischen Charakter." Thus, folk arts and traditions are democratic in character and explicitly revolutionary. Steinitz, *Die volkskundliche Arbeit in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, 18.

especially their own engagement in German folk culture through affinity groups, schools, and cooperatives.[463]

A number of projects were already underway when the *Volkskunde* institute was founded, including the *Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde*, a folksong archive (housed in Freiburg, but continuing as a German-German cooperative project), Adolf Spamer's multivolume collection of regional magic spells, as well as cooperations with existing *Volkskunde* museums. A publishing organ was needed for the institute—and in fact would be established in 1955: the *Deutsches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde*.[464] Steinitz furthermore argued for the expansion of *Volkskunde*'s presence at the universities, increasing the number of professorships and departments, and making the study of *Volkskunde* mandatory for students of *Germanistik* or pedagogy. Finally, greater connections to ethnographers in the USSR and other People's Republics should be sought so that they might learn from the Germans while pursuing common research agendas.

As for the key scientific questions that *Volkskunde* is particularly well-equipped to pose, Steinitz dwells on two elements. The first would become a point of contention in the field, both during its existence in the GDR and in post-*Wende* institutional memory, namely, the distinction and relationship between *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde*. We will return to this theme in the second section of this chapter. The second issue is the definition of *Volk*, the term so hotly debated among West German *Volkskundler* from the mid-1950s onward. For Steinitz, the solution to the taint of Nazism upon this most fundamental disciplinary concept can be found in Marxism: the *Volk* is the common people, the working classes upon which the existence of the entire culture and society

[463] Ibid., 17.

[464] The journal's original chief editor was Dr. Wolfgang Fraenger, while Wolfgang Steinitz, Paul Nedo, and Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, among others, sat on the editorial board. The first issue (1955) included, in addition to a number of articles by East German *Volkskundler*, an obituary for Adolf Spamer, reports of recent conferences, and bibliographies of current *Volkskunde* research in the GDR, Austria, and the USSR.

depends. There is no contrast between lower and upper classes in this sense of *Volk*—that was a leftover of Naumann's Nazified notion—but rather between an oppressed working class and a ruling bourgeois class. The role of the *Volkskundler*, then, is to view culture "objectively" as the creative product of the working masses.[465] As such, the new task of GDR *Volkskunde* is "to examine, on the one hand, the creative abilities of the workers, and on the other hand, the unique interweavings and relations between the proletariat and the ruling classes."[466]

Steinitz's vision for GDR *Volkskunde* channeled both Spamer's and the Communist state's plans for the field. His programmatic pronouncements and its echoes by Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann,[467] Pawoł (Paul) Nedo,[468] and others in the mid-1950s

---

[465] This notion of *Volk* differed from Spamer's, who adhered to a more psychological model of fundamental "Urelemente" that formed the basis of a national culture. Adolf Spamer, *Wesen, Wege und Ziele der Volkskunde.* (Leipzig: F. Brandstetter, 1928), 5.

[466] "einerseits die schöpferischen Fähigkeiten der Werktätigen, andererseits die eigenartigen Verflechtungen und Beziehungen zwischen den werktätigen und herrschenden Klassen herauszuarbeiten." Steinitz, *Die volkskundliche Arbeit in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, 33.

[467] Just three years after Steinitz's seminal speech, Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, a student of Adolf Spamer, would chronicle the accomplishment of the AdW *Volkskunde* institute in her contribution to a volume covering the first ten years of the academy's existence in its current form. The most impressive accomplishment since Spamer died was, in her estimation, Steinitz's work on folk songs, in cooperation with the Freiburg Volksliedarchiv that focused on the overlooked or suppressed "demokratisch-oppositionellen Äußerungen des Volkes, der Bauern, Arbeiter und Soldaten." Indeed, she concludes, *Volkskunde* in the GDR was proving the field to be more resilient than other sciences in resisting and overcoming "influences" of all kinds, up to and including Nazi abuses of cultural theory. With a new institute, new building, and growing research support, *Volkskunde* at the AdW seemed to prove the field had rehabilitated itself to become both scientifically sound and internationally respected—a successful "Neubeginn." She states: "Die Volkskunde mit ihrem weitumspannenden Stoffgebiet und ihrer sich erst entwickelnden Methodik reagierte von jeher gegen äußere Einflüsse von den verschiedensten Seiten her weit empfindlicher und empfänglicher als viele anderen Wissenschaften." Weber-Kellermann, "Zehn Jahre Institut für deutsche Volkskunde," 447.

[468] Pawoł Nedo, head of the Sorbisches Institut in Bautzen and Professor of German and west Slavic *Volkskunde* at the Humboldt University, gave a similar talk for the delegates of the Natur- und Heimatfreunde, a popular folk culture society in Weimar. Paul Nedo, "Bedeutung und Aufgaben der Volkskundeforschung der Gegenwart," *Aus der Arbeit der Natur- und Heimatfreunde* (1956): 140–51. In it, Nedo covers many of the same historical moments and figures marking GDR *Volkskunde* as carrying on a revolutionary, democratic, antifascist tradition, but with a more populist tone than Steinitz effects. Among the other key words that reappear and receive emphasis throughout the text are progressive, humanistic, and creative, more specifically, the creativity of the workers who would partner with academic *Volkskundler* in the production of new knowledge. Nedo in fact outlines a specific division of labor, whereby artifact

defined the *Aufgaben* to pursued, nuanced, and augmented by state mandate[469] through the next decade.[470] A new voice joined the refrain in 1956, when Wolfgang Jacobeit, a student of Will-Erich Peuckert, emigrated from Göttingen to take a position at the AdW *Volkskunde* institute in East Berlin. His history of the ethnography of peasant work and economy would become a classic contribution to *Volkskunde* historiography, recognized by East and West German scholars alike.[471] Not unlike West German *Volkskundler* reflecting on the discipline's early history after World War II, Jacobeit sets the work of the Grimm brothers as a starting point, and identifies the Romantic period as one with a double meaning for the field and for Germany in general: characterized by both

---

collection would be pursued by amateur enthusiasts, while analysis and interpretation would be undertaken by the trained experts in the academy. Nedo asserts that involving *Volkskundler* in the activities of local cultural organizations could, among other things, help to create the new national culture by educating those charged with designing architecture, public spaces and events about historical folk life.

One might say, then, that for GDR *Volkskunde*, there was no "Abschied from Volksleben" in the sense forwarded by the reformers at Tübingen in the 1960s; rather, the *Volk* reimagined as workers' culture in historical context (following Marxian social-economic theory) was to be embraced for the sake of developing a new socialist national culture. At the same time, both Steinitz and Nedo emphasized that a qualified cadre of academically trained *Volkskundler* must lead the research and analysis in order to counteract "krasse[n] Dilettantismus und grob[e] Verfälschung und Verzerrung des Volksgutes" (Steinitz, *Die volkskundliche Arbeit in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, 6.) On the political reimagining of the *Volk* in the GDR, see also Kehl, "Zur Etablierung der marxistisch-leninistischen Volkskunde am Zentralinstitut für Geschichte," esp. 247.

For further information on the engagement of amateur *Volkskunde* collaboration in the GDR, see Cornelia Kühn, "Sozialistische Wissenschaftspopularisierung: Volkskunde und Heimatgeschichte in der frühen DDR," in *Horizonte ethnografischen Wissens: Eine Bestandsaufnahme*, ed. Ina Dietzsch, Wolfgang Kaschuba, and Leonore Scholze-Irrlitz (Cologne: Böhlau, 2009), 131–54; Cornelia Kühn, Sibylla Nikolow, and Arne Schirrmacher, "'...eine neue, mit dem Volks verbundene Kultur entwickeln'—Laienkunst als Ressource für die Etablierung der Volkskunde in der frühen DDR," in *Wissenschaft und Öffentlichkeit als Ressource füreinander* (Frankfurt am Main, 2007), 197–216; Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*, 58–64.

469 On this point, see Kehl, "Zur Etablierung der marxistisch-leninistischen Volkskunde am Zentralinstitut für Geschichte."

470 See, for instance, Wolfgang Jacobeit and Ute Mohrmann, "Zum Gegenstand und zur Aufgabenstellung der Volkskunde in der DDR," *Letopis* 11/12 (1968): 94–103. *Letopis* was and continues to be the publishing organ at the Sorbisches Institut, covering all topics involved in that research: language, history, and culture (*Volkskunde* / *Kultur- und Kunstwissenschaft*).

471 Even Wolfgang Brückner, a vehement opponent of socialist-leaning *Volkskunde* East and West, acknowledges Jacobeit's volume as a major contribution to the field's historiography. Brückner, "Die Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Volkskunde," 29.

progressive and restorative/reactionary movements on the road to the establishment of a German nation-state.[472] The neo-Romantic spirit found its culmination in Nazism and its downfall,[473] Jacobeit claims—a critical sentiment shared by several West German critics discussed in Part I.[474] However, Jacobeit sides with his teacher, Peuckert, in asserting that there was an untainted, oppositional cadre of *Volkskundler*—including Peuckert—who maintained the field's integrity during the Third Reich. Indeed, in Jacobeit's view, Peuckert's study of workers' culture is West German *Volkskunde*'s saving grace. The last word is given to the emergence of East German *Volkskunde*, however, as Jacobeit concludes that *Volkskundler* from both countries have contributed to the successful development of an ethnography of work and economy.[475]

Carrying forward a critical review of the field, Jacobeit collaborated with Pawoł Nedo to convene an international working group on theoretical and methodological trends in *Volkskunde*, specifically with respect to studying the economic and social shifts of the last hundred years.[476] Often discussed in subsequent historiography with reference to the 1967 working meeting at Bad Saarow, the group comprised an East-West meeting

---

[472] Jacobeit, *Bäuerliche Arbeit und Wirtschaft: Ein Beitrag zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der deutschen Volkskunde*, 23.

[473] Ibid., 144.

[474] Among the West German criticisms of *Volkskunde* that Jacobeit cites are works by Heinz Maus, Hans Moser, and Karl-S. Kramer. Remarkably, he does not cite the most recent, provocative reform writings by Hermann Bausinger discussed in Part I. However, given that Jacobeit is engaging rigorously with the ideological confluences between *Volkskunde* cultural theory and Nazi cultural-racial ideology, Jacobeit's book is one of the first and only attempts at disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* within the GDR. See also Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*, 87.

[475] Jacobeit, *Bäuerliche Arbeit und Wirtschaft: Ein Beitrag zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der deutschen Volkskunde*, 144–150.

[476] The proceedings of a 1967 international conference on the central problems and methods of contemporary *Volkskunde* research stemming from the working group's efforts were published as Wolfgang Jacobeit and Pawoł Nedo, *Probleme und Methoden volkskundlicher Gegenwartsforschung: Vorträge und Diskussionen einer internationalen Arbeitstagung in Bad Saarow 1967* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1969).

of *Volkskunde* institutes from France, Sweden, West Germany,[477] Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Romania. While Jacobeit and Nedo suggest in the foreword to the conference proceedings that the ultimate goal would be to foster interdisciplinary historical research based on a Marxist theoretical foundation, later research in GDR government archives would reveal that the SED viewed the meeting as evidence that fruitful collaboration with capitalist West German *Volkskundler* was not possible, no matter how liberal or interested in mutual understanding they might appear.[478] Government suspicion of the ideologically corrosive potential of such international meetings led to tighter restrictions on West German *Volkskundler*'s travel to the GDR, and vice versa, through the 1970s.[479] Indeed, Jacobeit himself recalls being a target of state surveillance and persecution. [480]

Although the SED had taken an interest in *Volkskunde* already in the late 1950s with the heating up of the Cold War, by the time Wolfgang Steinitz died in 1967, the field was coming upon a major epistemic and bureaucratic structural shift, with Jacobeit and Nedo leading attempts to protect it from further political intervention, including the threat of top-down dismantling.[481] This shift was goaded by the SED's third *Hochschul- und Akademiereform*, beginning in the late 1960s. The first two such reforms took place in 1946 (in the Soviet Occupied Zone) and in 1951. The third phase was then part of the

---

[477] West German representatives were Hermann Bausinger from Tübingen and Rudolf Braun in West Berlin. Brinkel notes, however, that this would be the last visit from West German *Volkskundler* to the GDR for the next ten years. Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*, 92.

[478] Jacobeit and Nedo, *Probleme und Methoden volkskundlicher Gegenwartsforschung*, 8. Matthias Kehl makes this claim based on his reading of the archives of the SED Zentrale Informationsgruppe commission charged with documenting any politically subversive activities among GDR *Volkskundler*. Kehl, "Zur Etablierung der marxistisch-leninistischen Volkskunde am Zentralinstitut für Geschichte," 258.

[479] Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*, 92.

[480] Jacobeit describes the restrictions and even persecutions to which he and other *Volkskundler* in the GDR were subjected in *Von West nach Ost und zurück*, 116–117, 120–121, 136, 149.

[481] Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*, 85–86.

SED's overarching social-bureaucratic reform plan formulated at the Sixth SED Party Congress in 1963.

For research academies and universities, the reform initiative meant greater focus on specialization; more direct party involvement in research agendas and teaching curricula; and the establishment of a ministry of higher education with a section at each university to maintain institutes' orientation toward national interests.[482] Universities also were directed to orient curricula toward, and establish connections to the jobs sector. In other words, both research and teaching were to aim ultimately at industrial production. Within this process, as John Connelly notes, there emerged not only "stark imbalances" between the sciences and the humanities / fine arts, which had implications for institute funding and material resources. There also emerged a stronger emphasis on ideological education, enacted through suppressing dissent, purging "bourgeois" faculty, and integrating *Stasi* "inoffizielle Mitarbeiter" at each institute.[483]

Not surprisingly, the discursive performance of *Volkskunde*'s *Aufgaben* reappeared in the 1970s as an answer to these political pressures. A paradigmatic model for the kind of programmatic statement that these new state structural reforms provoked is a short 1971 article published by Wolfgang Jacobeit in the *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*.[484] The essay was more or less a direct response to the tasks set out for the field in the 1968 Politbüro resolution reiterating the

---

[482] Even the Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin was renamed the Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR in 1972 to emphasize a unique national identity apart from the FRG.

[483] "inoffizielle Mitarbeiter," or "IM," is the name given to GDR citizens who collaborated informally with the state security service, the *Staatssicherheitsdienst* (*Stasi*), for instance by gathering incriminating information about others. Connelly, "Humboldt Coopted: East German Universities, 1945–1989," 68. On the integration of *Volkskundler* in the state security system, see also Kehl, "Zur Etablierung der marxistisch-leninistischen Volkskunde am Zentralinstitut für Geschichte."

[484] Wolfgang Jacobeit, "Zur Aufgabenstellung der marxistischen Volkskunde im entwickelten gesellschaftlichen System des Sozialismus," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*, Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe, 20, no. 1 (1971): 48–57.

state's Marxist-Leninist identity and the SED Zentralkomitee's Ninth and Tenth Plenary Sessions overseen by Kurt Hager, known as the "chief ideologue" of GDR cultural policy.

While there are fleeting, subtle moments of "answering back,"[485] in general, Jacobeit's piece can be read as *Volkskunde*'s leadership repeating the party reform demands back to the SED. Namely, the field commits to "historicize" its research and teaching about the proletariat in order to situate contemporary culture in historical context, demonstrate workers' cultural progress up to the present, and thereby further assist in building up socialist society. Reiterating Steinitz's vision of a democratic discipline, the field also commits to collaborating with lay researchers ("*Laienforschung*") and museums in order to involve the working class in, and expose them to, *Volkskunde* research. Moreover, *Volkskunde* at the universities would enact initiatives to support students' transition to industrial jobs.

Jacobeit does, however, also name some caveats and limitations that this plan implies for *Volkskunde*. Firstly, *Volkskunde* as a scholarly field is not involved only in fulfilling cultural-political goals—the new government mandates are only an entry point for further research in a broad field of inquiry. That being said, to meet its particular cultural-political *Aufgaben* would require substantial reform to further clarify and unify teaching, research, and resulting "social practice." *Volkskundler* also must further examine contemporary bourgeois (e.g., West German) *Volkskunde* in order to build the legitimacy of the Marxist-Leninist perspective. In their cooperation with *Heimatforschung*, *Volkskundler* must help to free such research from romanticizing

[485] Tentativeness regarding the top-down interdisciplinary reorganization of *Volkskunde* is also reflected in the title of one of Jacobeit's next publications: "Die Volkskunde, eine eigenständige historische Disziplin," *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 22, no. 4 (1974): 443–47.

"*Heimattümelei*"[486] and to reorient it to rigorous scientific observation, recording, and study of the development of socialist life ways ("*Lebensweise*") and cultural activity.[487] And, the field would have to devise concrete measures for pursuing the newly articulated goal of becoming a fundamentally historical field that can help to raise the consciousness of the proletariat.[488] Jacobeit concludes by outlining several general steps that academic *Volkskundler* must take over the next ten years in light of these *Aufgaben*.

To demonstrate the progress *Volkskunde* already had made toward the goals from its establishment in the GDR, Jacobeit revisits the contributions of Wolfgang Steinitz and Pawoł Nedo in laying the foundation for Marxist-Leninist *Volkskunde*—Steinitz by beginning the mission already through his resistance and exile during the Nazi period, and Nedo by helping to historicize the field by integrating it with Marxist-Leninist historical research and university curricula and by building up interest and university enrollment through establishing connections with lay *Heimatforschung* groups. Even the field's latest achievement, the international historical working group that met at Bad Saarow, is cast as a step toward the state-supported interdisciplinary reorganization of *Volkskunde* as a fundamentally historical discipline. While the field was already on its way in this direction, maintains Jacobeit, the SED-initiated structural changes represent a qualitative difference from former historicizing efforts. Here, Jacobeit refers to the absorption of the German *Volkskunde* institute under the central AdW institute for historical study (now called the Wissenschaftsbereich Kulturgeschichte) and the combination of *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* as the Bereich Ethnographie under the history section of the Humboldt-Universität.

---

[486] That is, excessive pride in one's homeland (*Heimat*).
[487] Jacobeit, "Zur Aufgabenstellung der marxistischen Volkskunde im entwickelten gesellschaftlichen System des Sozialismus," 8.
[488] Ibid., 3–4.

Jacobeit reiterates throughout the article the importance of the theoretical-ideological foundation laid by the research and higher education reforms for *Volkskunde*'s future development, both within the academy and university, and in the public sphere. The article documents the structural transformations of GDR *Volkskunde* in the 1960s and 70s, as the field was forcibly moved toward the status of a special subfield of history in the ultimate service of the socialist state. With respect to the field's published programmatic responses, Jacobeit's narrative performance also represents a reversal of the relationship between historiography and structural forms in the institutional memory of West German *Volkskunde*. Instead of mobilizing disciplinary history to resolve internal conflicts borne of the discipline's fraught past under Nazism, GDR *Volkskundler* had to muster historical precedents to demonstrate that their field was in line with present political decisions concerning the structure and purpose of higher education and research.

The state's political-ideological intervention in scholarly activity is unquestionably a dominant trope in GDR *Volkskunde*'s historiography—whether to appease the state or to critically evaluate the extent of government interference in the field. Still, to focus on the precarious boundary between state and science in the case of GDR *Volkskunde* is to risk repeating the debated trope of *doppelte* (double) *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, whereby an incongruous comparison is drawn between the SED and the NSDAP.[489] As this dissertation ultimately argues, postwar German *Volkskunde*'s institutional memory cannot be reduced to a matter of overcoming political

[489] Also referred to as "Diktaturenvergleich" (dictatorship comparison) this trope has been criticized for, among other reasons, serving a political function of delegitimating the existence of the GDR. For a list of studies that employ the trope, see Fischer and Lorenz, *Lexikon der "Vergangenheitsbewältigung" in Deutschland*, 275–279. For a recent critique of tropes of GDR historiography, see Silke Arnold-de Simine and Susannah Radstone, "The GDR and the Memory Debate," in *Remembering and Rethinking the GDR: Multiple Perspectives and Plural Authenticities*, ed. Anna Saunders and Debbie Pinfold, Palgrave Macmillan Memory Studies (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 19–33.

entanglement—National Socialist or East German Communist. To exemplify this argument, the next section of this chapter introduces an alternative reading of GDR *Volkskunde*'s institutional memory via the trope of boundary maintenance and transgression.

INTERDISCIPLINARY AND INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY ISSUES

The disciplinary program set by Wolfgang Steinitz in 1953 was still being worked out by GDR *Volkskundler* by the time of the third *Hochschul- und Akademiereform* (1967/68). While the original ideal of studying workers' culture in historical context via the theory and methods of Marxist-Leninist historical-dialectical materialism was the explicit goal, the practical implementation of this antibourgeois model of *Volkskunde* remained incomplete. In the 1960s, the state stepped in with its own program for the field, which Matthias Kehl summarizes as "Kritik and Abgrenzung von der 'bürgerlichen' Volkskunde und Historisierung unter dem Banner der Kulturgeschichte"—in effect, two boundary issues.[490] That is, the construction or deconstruction of disciplinary and international boundaries were proposed as means to bring *Volkskunde*'s mission to full fruition and into line with the state's new, more rigorous political-ideological goals.

Camps soon emerged within the GDR *Volkskunde* community, either supporting or objecting to the field's reorganization around the government directives, each strategically mobilizing disciplinary history—both prior to and within the GDR—when answering the cultural-political demands of the state. Thus, not only is the boundary

[490] "Criticism and demarcation from "bourgeois" *Volkskunde* and historicization under the banner of cultural history." Kehl, "Zur Etablierung der marxistisch-leninistischen Volkskunde am Zentralinstitut für Geschichte," 251.

between state and science always already at play. The case of GDR *Volkskunde* also demonstrates the need for a more critical and holistic study of the trope of boundaries in the historiography of *Volkskunde*, and perhaps of German postwar sciences more broadly.

This section begins by examining the contours of the trope of interdisciplinary boundaries, and then turns to how this historiographic framing interacts with that of international boundaries. In treating the two issues together, this case exemplifies the larger argument of Parts II and III of this study: that international relations—between scientific communities or the states that house them—are often used as justification for maintaining or breaching disciplinary boundaries, and vice versa. For this reason, while the issue of interdisciplinary boundaries serves as the entry point, the section will cover the many confluences between these two major boundary themes.

We begin by returning to the early programmatic writings of leading East German *Volkskundler*, wherein one finds that the issue of *Volkskunde*'s interdisciplinary boundaries is, in fact, not a new one—neither in the GDR nor prior to it. However, in the first (1946) and second (1951) research and higher education reforms enacted in the Soviet Occupied Zone and the GDR, the boundary with which *Volkskundler* were most concerned was not with the field of history, but rather that which divided *Volkskunde* from *Völkerkunde*. When the two fields were suddenly institutionally reorganized together according to the Soviet single-field model of *Ethnographie*, the *Volkskundler* reacted with programmatic performances.[491] However, while this development would

[491] Julian V. Bromley, director of the Institute for Ethnography at the USSR Academy of Sciences and spokesperson for Soviet *Ethnographie* to the non-Russian-speaking world, both East and West, describes the holistic model of *Ethnographie* thus: "Die Auffassungen über die Ethnographie sind bekanntlich in den verschiedenen Ländern recht unterschiedlich. In der vorliegenden Arbeit geht der Autor in erster Linie von jenen Auffassungen über diese Wissenschaftsdisziplin aus, wie sie heute von der Mehrzahl der sowjetischen Wissenschaftler vertreten werden. Um nicht vorzugreifen sei hier nur soviel bemerkt, dass nach dieser Konzeption das Forschungsobjekt der Ethnographie *alle Völker, Ethnien, darstellen*, sowohl die in ihrer kulturellen Entwicklung zurückgebliebenen als auch die hochentwickelten, *sowohl das eigene Volk*

appear to pose a further threat to the already discredited discipline, it was not uniformly rejected by the *Volkskundler*. The fault lines of the debate are well represented in articulations by Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann (against) and Wolfgang Steinitz (for), with each recounting a version of the field's history to defend her/his position.

For Weber-Kellermann, founding figures like Adolf Spamer and John Meier articulated the logic of having an independent field that, while certainly sharing *Völkerkunde*'s interest in questions of culture, nonetheless works on a unique set of problems using a unique set of methods, all related directly to the fact that the researcher is a member of the culture she/he studies. She admits that there is a precedent in the history of ethnology in Europe, set by the Eastern European branches, of combining the two fields along methodological grounds (i.e., *Ethnographie*). But Weber-Kellermann also locates Germany's *Volkskunde* within a *Western* European tradition that separates out "folklore" as a field aligned with philology. To this end, she invokes both the recent

---

als auch die Völker anderer Länder." Julian V. Bromley, *Ethnos und Ethnographie* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1977), 5, emphasis added.

This holistic understanding of human culture aligned with the Marxist-Leninist historical-materialist theory of culture, which was oriented not toward dichotomies of ancient versus modern, or historical versus nonhistorical, but rather toward the conditions of material production and resulting social class structures that had developed to varying levels in different nations. *Ethnographie* is thus a "science of all peoples at all stages of their development" which ultimately "corroborate[s] and concretise[s]" Marxist-Leninist theory. Julian V. Bromley, *Soviet Ethnography: Main Trends* (Moscow: Social Sciences Today, 1977), 56, 61. The study of ethnicity ("*ethnos*") and national culture also was oriented pragmatically toward the communist political-economic goal of "strengthening trust and friendship" (Ibid., 12) among the nations and ethnicities comprising the USSR and throughout the world in part by changing "the life and culture of the formerly backward peoples." Julian V. Bromley, "Ethnological Studies in the USSR, 1965–1969," in *Soviet Ethnology and Anthropology Today*, ed. Julian V. Bromley (The Hague: Mouton, 1974), 18. See also Karoline Noack and Martina Krause, "Ethnographie as a Unified Anthropological Science in the German Democratic Republic," in *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies: Socialist Era Anthropology in East-Central Europe*, ed. Chris M. Hann, Mihály Sárkány, and Peter Skalník (Münster: LIT, 2005), 26–53.

The Soviet single-field model for cultural anthropology was introduced in the GDR by Russian *Ethnograph* Sergej A. Tokarev, who began evangelizing the Soviet paradigm when he arrived at the Humboldt University of Berlin in 1951. Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*, 77. Hence, Teresa Brinkel asserts that "Die Institutionalisierung der Volkskunde an der Berliner Humboldt-Universität nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg last sich nur in Verbindung mit der Völkerkunde untersuchen." Ibid., 76. As the present work's focus is on how *Volkskundler* in the GDR told their field's history, the historiographic articulations of GDR *Völkerkundler* will remain on the margins of this treatment.

vanguard work of Scandinavian folklorist Sigurd Erixon, Arnold van Gennep in France, and Richard Weiss in Switzerland, as well as the older German tradition set forth by the Grimm brothers and Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl.[492]

Still, Weber-Kellermann appears to be aware that her argument cannot be based on German *Volkskunde*'s tradition alone. She goes on to note how specific regional cultural / philological studies have traditionally been granted independent departments apart from *Völkerkunde*. Thus, she asks: If *Volkskunde* is also to be considered just another regionally specialized branch of that field, then why not let it retain its institutional independence, as well? Finally, resorting to a pseudonationalist political argument derived from Austrian *Volkskundler* Viktor von Geramb, Weber-Kellermann concludes that *Volkskunde* has the unique *Aufgabe* of examining in detail what is particular about the German *Stamm* or *Volk*, in contrast to *Völkerkunde*'s concern with identifying universal human cultural forms.[493]

Steinitz, a proponent of the combination, soon answers Weber-Kellermann (and others who have argued similarly) in his inaugural address to the 1953 *Volkskunde* conference in Berlin.[494] It is his position that *Volkskunde*, *Völkerkunde*, and *Ethnographie*

---

[492] Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, "Zum Problem: Volkskunde und Völkerkunde," *Forschungen und Fortschritt* 27, no. 1 (1953): 30–31.

[493] Ibid., 31–32.

[494] Steinitz also lays out his position briefly in his 1953 address to the AdW: "Die Völkerkunde oder Ethnographie ist die einheitliche Wissenschaft der Erforschung aller Völker. Ein absoluter, prinzipieller Unterschied in der ethnographischen Erforschung z.B. eines europäischen und eines afrikanischen Volkes besteht nicht." Steinitz, *Die volkskundliche Arbeit in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, 28. For Wolfgang Jacobeit's thoughts on the significance of that disciplinary collaboration, after German reunification, see his article "Ethnologie und Alltagsgeschichte: Zum Gegenstand von Völkerkunde und Volkskunde," *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde* 88, no. 3/4 (1992): 129–41.

It is notable that Steinitz's article is cited nowhere in the conference proceedings of an international workshop hosted in West Berlin dedicated to finding common ground for *Volkskundler* and *Völkerkundler* working on European culture. Heide Nixdorff and Thomas Hauschild, eds., *Europaïsche Ethnologie: Theorie- und Methodendiskussion aus ethnologischer und volkskundlicher Sicht* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1982). Instead, the standard reference is Gerhard Lutz, "Volkskunde und Ethnologie," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 65, no. 1 (1969): 65–80.

are synonyms; the boundaries between them are the imaginary construct of disciplinary historiography.[495] One by one, Steinitz dismantles Weber-Kellermann's arguments for maintaining *Volkskunde* as a bureaucratically separate discipline, mobilizing the same historical sources and precedents, which he rereads or critiques to support his position. He recovers other facts of disciplinary history to make his point, as well. For instance, Steinitz notes that the first *Volkskunde* journal, the *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde*, established in 1891, did not distinguish between the two fields.

Steinitz concludes that the bureaucratic forms are the arbitrary result of the historical, often politically inflected (by nationalism, colonialism, fascism), development of scholarship; the emergence of specializations within the study of culture is no reason to deny the fundamental unity of the field. *Volkskunde* in German history indeed has a robust tradition, but, Steinitz warns, one must not become married to certain terminology, lest one begin seeking data to fill the categories, rather than allowing new knowledge to inform the epistemic structures of a scholarly field.[496]

Steinitz's opinion on the matter resonated at a 1955 international conference organized by the Commission Internationale des Arts et Traditions Populaires (CIAP) and held in Arnhem, the Netherlands.[497] There, folklorists from across Europe discussed the status of the field following World War II. Among the topics discussed was the proposal for a common name by which the field would be recognized internationally. The term proposed was *Ethnologie*. Although most of the countries represented, including the

---

[495] Wolfgang Steinitz, "Volkskunde und Völkerkunde," *Deutsches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 1, no. 1 (1955): 270.

[496] Ibid., 274.

[497] Steinitz's own invitation to the Arnhem conference was revoked by the Dutch foreign ministry. He would have been the only representative of a socialist country in attendance. While the message of East-West collaboration he conveyed via Weber-Kellermann was widely well received, his proxy still had to field accusations from some West German *Volkskundler* that Steinitz was a communist spy. For details of the "scandal of Arnhem," see Annette Leo, *Leben als Balance-Akt: Wolfgang Steinitz: Kommunist, Jude, Wissenschaftler* (Berlin: Metropol, 2005), 318–322.

GDR, agreed to take up the name in some form, the Western German-speaking countries refused, citing "practical" reasons. The main reason had to do with the fact that the field of *Völkerkunde* in the Western Occupied Zones had decided, shortly after the war ended, to uniformly change the field's name to *Ethnologie*. Thus, West German *Volkskundler* feared that to be covered by *Ethnologie* as an international umbrella term would position their field as the Germanist subdiscipline of *Ethnologie*, threatening its independent scholarly status and separate institutional presence.[498] Although the term *Ethnologie* would not be applied in East German institutional titles, the rapprochement between *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* that the term represented was a welcome development that Steinitz committed to fostering.[499]

But while the two fields were housed together bureaucratically, and international public relations would suggest they were happy together, in the words of Teresa Brinkel,

---

[498] Weber-Kellermann describes the situation thus: ""Es darf hier hinzugefügt werden, daß die osteuropäischen Staaten und die Deutsche Demokratische Republik diesen Weg bereits weitgehend in Theorie und Praxis eingeschlagen haben. . . . Die Gruppe der westdeutschen, österreichischen und schweizerischen Forscher wandte geschlossen gegen die Einführung der 'Ethnologie' als international Bezeichnung, weniger aus prinzipiellen als aus praktischen Erwägungen. Bei voller Erkenntnis der nahen Blutsverwandtschaft von Volks- und Völkerkunde sei bei dem Stand der wissenschaftsgeschichtlichen Entwicklung in den genannten deutschsprachigen Ländern eine völlige Verschmelzung ohne empfindlichen Prestigeverlust für die Volkskunde nicht möglich." ("It can be added here that the eastern European countries and the Geman Democratic Republic had already largely paved the way in theory and praxis. . . . The group of West German, Austrian, and Swiss researchers turned completely against the introduction of '*Ethnologie*' as an international term, less out of principle than out of practical considerations. To give full recognition to the close blood relationship between Volks- and Völkerkunde would mean, given the state of historical disciplinary development in the named German-speaking countries, that a complete merger would not be possible without a sensitive loss of prestige for Volkskunde.") Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, "Internationaler Volkskundekongress vom 20. bis 24. September 1955 in Arnhem / Holland," *Deutsches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 2 (1956): 265. It is interesting to note that the West German *Volkskundler* Bruno Schier's report on the conference for the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* makes no mention of the contentiousness of the naming discussion. Bruno Schier, "Internationaler Kongress für Volkskunde in Arnheim (20.–24. September 1955)," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 52 (1955): 297–98.

[499] Weber-Kellermann, "Internationaler Volkskundekongress vom 20. bis 24. September 1955 in Arnhem / Holland," 266. Compared to the fear West German *Volkskundler* purportedly expressed at Arnhem that their field would lose independent status were they to integrate with *Völkerkunde* / *Ethnologie*, in the GDR *Volkskunde* was the field with the advantage, as it appeared better equipped to enact the party mandate to research contemporary workers' culture. Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*, 93.

"This unity was nonetheless internally fragile and marked by conflict."[500] The tension between *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* in the GDR—and among the *Volkskundler* themselves regarding their field's relationship to its neighbor—would only become amplified with the 1968 reforms that expanded *Ethnographie* as the fields' common structural form, and subsumed all of the cultural sciences, moreover, under *Geschichtswissenschaft* (historical science).

Wolfgang Jacobeit's 1971 response to the SED's research and education reforms of the late 1960s / early 1970s, discussed above, offers an overview of a significant rupture in GDR *Volkskunde*'s epistemological and bureaucratic structures as the field was pushed closer to its disciplinary neighbors in *Geschichtswissenschaft* and *Kulturwissenschaft*. Two years later, Jacobeit's colleague, Bernhard Weissel, would likewise outline the political-interdisciplinary reorientation and its implications for the field's *Aufgaben*. Publishing in the first issue of the newly reopened and renamed *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde und Kulturgeschichte*—the *Deutsches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* having been shuttered in 1971—Weissel, too, presents a story of continuity and solidarity with explicitly socialist scholarship that was necessary to meet party expectations. An opponent of Jacobeit's international and critical orientation, Weissel's goal in recounting the field's history is not to assert *Volkskunde*'s status as a unique and independent field, so much as to bring the field more securely into the party line.

Weissel posits 1945 not as a "grave" but rather a "caesura" that the field has been working steadily since the 1950s to overcome. Typical of programmatic statements on the political-scientific "Neuaufbau" of *Volkskunde* in the GDR following World War II, and its reformation in the 1960s/70s, Weissel goes on to address the issue of 1945 via

[500] "Diese Einheit war jedoch nach innen brüchig und durch Konflikte gekennzeichnet." Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*, 76.

comparisons of how the field is practiced in other countries. This discourse is specifically a matter of drawing a contrast against West German *Volkskunde*, on the one hand, and a comparison with Soviet *Ethnographie*, on the other. *Volkskunde* in the FRG he posits as still tainted by the capitalist-bourgeois ideology, imperialism, and militarism of the Nazi era.[501] Even the efforts of "critical" factions, especially the reformers in Tübingen, were to be viewed with suspicion: their supposedly progressive stance in criticizing Nazi-era *Volkskunde*, reorienting research from peasant to workers' culture, and adopting the Frankfurt School's neo-Marxian social theory, while moving in the right direction, was still deeply couched in old bourgeois notions of culture.[502]

Still this generation of GDR scholars knew that the work of shedding the baggage of capitalist-bourgeois notions of culture that still burdens West German *Volkskunde* and of building a research profile oriented toward the proletariat as a historical subject of cultural processes is still incomplete in the GDR.[503] Thus, the means of achieving *Volkskunde*'s mission would be not simply to strengthen the boundary over against FRG *Volkskunde*, but to establish stronger links to the East. Stronger Eastward bridges mean, in turn, further institutionalization of the Russian model of *Ethnographie* that combines *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* in one discipline. Such interdisciplinary and international cooperation surrounding a common core of Marxist-Leninist historical and social theory will, according to Weissel, help to finally free *Volkskunde* from all bourgeois residues, as

---

[501] See, for instance, Bernhard Weissel, "Zum Gegenstand und zu den Aufgaben volkskundlicher Wissenschaft in der DDR," *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde und Kulturgeschichte* 16, Neue Folge 1 (1973): 9–44; Hermann Strobach, Rudolf Weinhold, and Bernhard Weissel, "Volkskundliche Forschungen in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik: Bilanz und Ausblick," *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde und Kulturgeschichte* 17, Neue Folge 2 (1974): 9–39; Bernhard Weissel, ed., *Kultur und Ethnos: Zur Kritik der bürgerlichen Auffassungen über die Rolle der Kultur in Geschichte und Gesellschaft* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1980).

[502] Weissel, "Zum Gegenstand und zu den Aufgaben volkskundlicher Wissenschaft in der DDR," 11–14.

[503] Ibid., 22.

well as to stave off scholarly stagnation. More importantly, it will help bring *Volkskunde* further into line with the "real-humanistischen Anliegen des Sozialismus."[504]

Building bridges to the East and erecting boundaries to the West does not mean, however, that GDR *Volkskundler* should operate in complete isolation from the FRG. Indeed, Weissel encourages GDR *Volkskundler* to keep an eye on disciplinary developments in the FRG in order to identify where the field was going wrong there, and so to further be reassured of the superiority of Marxist-Leninist *Volkskunde*.[505] Of course, exchange between West German and East German *Volkskundler* predates GDR political mandates to keep watch against the class enemy. Leading *Volkskundler* of the first generation—Steinitz, Jacobeit, Weber-Kellermann—had begun their studies (and completed them, in Weber-Kellermann's case) under *Volkskundler* who remained in the West. After national division, East and West German *Volkskundler* met at international conferences, in the GDR, the FRG, and abroad.[506]

Although travel between the countries was restricted in the 1960s/70s—remembered by Jacobeit as a reward-and-punishment instrument wielded by the SED against recalcitrant scholars[507]—the works of Hermann Bausinger, Utz Jeggle, Helge Gerndt, Ina-Maria Greverus, Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, and other West German scholars still appeared frequently in the book review and debate sections of the *Deutsches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* / *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde und Kulturgeschichte*, and

---

[504] "the real-humanistic concern of socialism." Ibid., 10. This programmatic stance is reiterated in a coauthored article in the next issue of the journal, where reference to Steinitz's own interdisciplinary vision serves to further amplify the argument. Strobach, Weinhold, and Weissel, "Volkskundliche Forschungen in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik: Bilanz und Ausblick."

[505] Weissel, "Zum Gegenstand und zu den Aufgaben volkskundlicher Wissenschaft in der DDR," 17–18, 21, 30–32. As representative of the "critical" elements in FRG *Volkskunde* Weissel mentions Hermann Bausinger, Hans Moser, and Karl-S. Kramer.

[506] See the "Berichte und Mitteilungen" sections of the *Deutsches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* / *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde und Kulturgeschichte* for the many international conferences East German *Volkskundler* attended.

[507] Jacobeit, *Von West nach Ost und zurück*, 136.

increasingly so from the 1970s onward. Even Wolfgang Brückner, who so polemically railed against socialist *Volkskunde*, East and West, even up to reunification,[508] had his books reviewed there. Thus, the mutual gaze of East and West German *Volkskundler* in the journal archive and conference proceedings seems to upend the historiographic trope of East German isolation.[509]

Even in the early programmatic writings of Wolfgang Steinitz, one finds an attitude of openness toward factions of FRG *Volkskunde.* Steinitz believed from the beginning that a "critical *Volkskunde*" might be pursued together with like-minded, "responsible" West German *Volkskundler* with whom contact was already established, namely, the Tübingen School.[510] Still, he cautions that unscientific (i.e., political-ideological) strains deriving from the infiltration of American political ideology

---

[508] Recall Brückner's radio interviews lambasting communist elements in Tübingen and Bremen. "Volkskunde im Widerstreit. 1. Volkstumsideologie einst und jetzt," *Wissenschaft und Bildung* (Deutschlandfunk, January 10, 1972); "Volkskunde im Widerstreit. 2. Klassenideologie oder kritische Reflexion," *Wissenschaft und Bildung* (Deutschlandfunk, January 17, 1972); "Volkskunde im Widerstreit. 3. Theorienstreit als Methodenproblem," *Wissenschaft und Bildung* (Deutschlandfunk, January 24, 1972); "Volkskunde im Widerstreit. 4. Reformdiskussion und die Folgen," *Wissenschaft und Bildung* (Deutschlandfunk, January 31, 1972). His latest rant, used by Brinkel to introduce her history of GDR *Volkskunde*, was Wolfgang Brückner, "Volkskundler in der DDR," *Bayerische Blätter für Volkskunde*, no. 2 (1990): 84–111. See also Wolfgang Brückner, "Nachlese zum Problem der Kulturwissenschaften in der ehemaligen DDR," *Bayerische Blätter für Volkskunde*, no. 2 (1990): 139–49.

[509] Scholars have challenged the trope of isolation especially with reference to media and scientific communities, in particular the field of history. See, for instance, essays by Axel Schildt, Matrin Sabrow, and Werner Bramke in Arnd Bauerkämper, Martin Sabrow, and Bernd Stöver, eds., *Doppelte Zeitgeschichte: Deutsch-deutsche Beziehungen 1945–1990* (Bonn: J.H.W. Dietz, 1998). This critique is being carried forward in new GDR Studies research, as April Eisman has discussed in her article on art flows between East and West, "East German Art and the Permeability of the Berlin Wall." Among the recent contributors to this perspective of GDR-FRG relations, Eisman cites Greg Castillo, *Cold War on the Home Front: The Soft Power of Midcentury Design* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010); Patrick Major, *Behind the Berlin Wall East Germany and the Frontiers of Power* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); Claudia Mesch, *Modern Art at the Berlin Wall Demarcating Culture in the Cold War Germanys* (New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2008); Andreas Huyssen, "German Painting in the Cold War," *New German Critique* 110 (2010): 209–27.

[510] Steinitz, *Die volkskundliche Arbeit in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, 33. For a later articulation of GDR *Volkskunde*'s position vis-à-vis "critical *Volkskunde*" in the FRG, see Hermann Strobach, "Positionen und Grenzen der 'kritischen Volkskunde' in der BRD," *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde und Kulturgeschichte* 16, Neue Folge 1 (1973): 45–91.

threatened to eclipse a common disciplinary past and hinder future East-West cooperation.

By 1973, six years after Steinitz's death, Bernhard Weissel would demarcate a complete split between the fields beginning immediately in 1945.[511] This polemical historiographic repositioning is not surprising, considering the political pressure on GDR *Volkskunde* in the 1960s and 1970s. But Weissel's divisive discourse did not necessarily reflect a stifling of relations between East- and West- *Volkskundler*. More likely, it is indicative of divisions within GDR *Volkskunde* concerning how the field should be imagined and pursued across the political boundary. Such intradisciplinary disagreements were present in the FRG, as well. For instance, while figures like Weissel in the GDR and Wolfgang Brückner in the FRG saw no possible middle ground for interaction, Wolfgang Jacobeit and Ute Mohrmann continued relations with *Volkskundler* at the Tübingen Institute. Those ongoing interactions, though occurring along limited channels, would continue up to national reunification.[512]

From the perspective of West German *Volkskunde* historiography, the position of GDR *Volkskunde* in the history of the field depended on the historiographer's position on

---

[511] Indeed, Weissel criticizes Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, who in 1960 had left her post at the AdW to complete her *Habilitation* at the *Institut für mitteleuropäische Volksforschung* in Marburg, for attempting to situate GDR *Volkskunde* as part of the German *Volkskunde* tradition. Weissel insists, rather, that his field's present and historical identity is aligned with Soviet *Ethnographie* and that Weber-Kellermann is erroneously applying her own vision to history. Weissel, "Zum Gegenstand und zu den Aufgaben volkskundlicher Wissenschaft in der DDR," 31–32. Weber-Kellermann, *Deutsche Volkskunde zwischen Germanistik und Sozialwissenschaften*, 92–93.

[512] See, for example, the joint research projects documented in Helmut Ottenjann, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, and Museumsdorf Cloppenburg, eds., *Kulturgeschichte und Sozialgeschichte im Freilichtmuseum: Historische Realität und Konstruktion des Geschichtlichen in historischen Museen. Referate der 6. Arbeitstagung der Arbeitsgruppe "Kulturgeschichtliche Museen" im Museumsdorf Cloppenburg, Niedersächsisches Freilichtmuseum*, 1. Auflage (Cloppenburg: Das Museumsdorf, 1985); Wolfgang Kaschuba and Ute Mohrmann, *Blick-Wechsel Ost-West: Beobachtungen zur Alltagskultur in Ost- und Westdeutschland* (Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1992). See also the conference proceedings, Wolfgang Kaschuba, Gottfried Korff, and Bernd Jürgen Warneken, eds., *Arbeiterkultur seit 1945, Ende oder Veränderung?* (Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1991).

German-German scientific and state relations. Wolfgang Brückner's 1982 historiographic conference completely excluded GDR *Volkskunde* from the discussion, for instance. On the other hand, in her highly popular introduction to the field, Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, who worked in both the GDR and the FRG, presents German *Volkskunde* as being of one tradition, both still contributing to a common field, but presently split along a political divide.[513] This position is reflected also in Munich *Volkskundler* Helge Gerndt's collection of classic postwar articulations of the meaning of *Volk* for *Volkskunde*, among which he includes a programmatic essay by Jacobeit and Mohrmann.[514] Neither Gerndt nor Weber-Kellermann gives equal weight to the two sides in their respective treatments, yet neither narrative implies a clean break between them. The same can be said of Rolf Brednich's (Göttingen) edited 1988 *Grundriß der Volkskunde*.[515] But while Weber-Kellermann, Gerndt, Brednich, and the Tübingen circle,[516] as well, all included East German contributions to the field in their historiographic works, those mentioned were typically limited to key works by Steinitz, Jacobeit, and Mohrmann posited as relevant to the whole field, as opposed to being representative of an East German tradition.

---

513 See Weber-Kellermann, *Deutsche Volkskunde zwischen Germanistik und Sozialwissenschaften*, 141–142; Weber-Kellermann, *Einführung in die Volkskunde, Europäische Ethnologie*, 141–145; Weber-Kellermann, Bimmer, and Becker, *Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie*, 180–187.

514 Gerndt, *Fach und Begriff "Volkskunde,"* 209–222; Jacobeit and Mohrmann, "Zum Gegenstand und zur Aufgabenstellung der Volkskunde in der DDR." In the bibliography at the back of the book, Gerndt also includes titles from Wolfgang Steinitz, Hermann Strobach, Bernhard Weissel, as well as multiple works by Russian ethnographer Julian Bromley on the topic of interdisciplinary and international disciplinary relations.

515 Brednich, *Grundriss der Volkskunde*. Here, again, GDR *Volkskunde* as such is mentioned only very briefly, and the work of GDR *Volkskundler* is significantly underrepresented and limited to the usual figures: Jacobeit, Mohrmann, Peesch, Steinitz, and Strobach. This may have to do, in part, with the fact that East German *Volkskundler* did not contribute to the volume, whereas Austrian and Swiss contributions are included. It is not known whether this was a matter of political restrictions on scholarly collaboration or a sense within the West German community that their tradition had more in common with the Austrian and the Swiss than with the East German.

516 See, for instance, Korff, Jeggle, and Geiger, *Abschied vom Volksleben*; Bausinger, *Volkskunde*, 1971; Bausinger et al., *Grundzüge der Volkskunde*, 1999.

If the East German approach to cultural research was mentioned as such, then it was with tentativeness regarding the scientific legitimacy of limiting of one's object and methodology to Marxism-Leninism.[517] The general pattern in West German historiography, then, was to sequester GDR *Volkskunde* book-, chapter-, or section-wise, implying a separate tradition whose scientific continuity with West German *Volkskunde* (and *Völkerkunde*) was, if not completely ended, then significantly disrupted, by Germany's Occupier division.[518] East and West German ambivalence regarding questions of continuity—a variation of the boundary trope—in the field's historical development thus concerned not only how disciplinary ideas and forms traversed the Nazi-era that precipitated the national split, but also the prewar and present relationship between GDR and FRG *Volkskunde*.

East German *Volkskunde*'s self-presentation and reception in other parts of the West likewise reflected the broad trope of boundary construction and deconstruction set in historical context. Although East German *Volkskundler* rarely published in West German journals,[519] they did publish a great deal in other international journals, East and West. In the 1960s especially, there was a flourishing of articles by GDR authors in Western European and American anthropology journals describing their field's origins (beginning always with Spamer and Steinitz), institutional organization, and unique research contributions.[520] Whether implied in the presentational structure or explicitly

---

[517] See, for instance, Emmerich, *Zur Kritik der Volkstumsideologie*, 177–178.

[518] See also Wiegelmann, Zender, and Heilfurth, *Volkskunde*, 33–34, 91–92; Greverus, *Kultur und Alltagswelt*, 82–85, 153, 225–226. Compare Ulla Johansen, "Ethnologie in der DDR," in *Ethnologie: Eine Einführung*, ed. Hans Fischer (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1983), 303–18. Though written for an introduction to *Ethnologie* in West Germany, Johansen treats GDR *Ethnographie* as observing, more or less willingly, the Soviets' unified disciplinary framework.

[519] This imbalance in East-West German publication seems to confirm Wolfgang Kaschuba's observation concerning "Ethnographie in der DDR," that "die Kommunikation zwischen Ost und West gestaltete sich teilweise etwas einseitig." Kaschuba, *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*, 88.

[520] Eva Lips, "Anthropological and Folkloristic Institutions in the German Democratic Republic," *Current Anthropology* 2 (1961): 65–67; Reinhard Peesch and Rolf Döhler, "Folklore Studies in the German

stated, contrast to predivision- and West German *Volkskunde*, especially with regard to the closer relationship between the field and its neighbor *Völkerkunde* in the GDR, is a typical characteristic of the international disciplinary public relations campaign.

A second, related characteristic emphasized in these discursive identity performances is the alignment of GDR *Volkskunde* with Soviet *Ethnographie*—a framing also adopted by Western observers of the field.[521] But, as was mentioned earlier, continuity with Soviet and Eastern European *Ethnographie* was neither natural nor intuitive to all GDR *Volkskundler*, and thus required a bidirectional public relations campaign of its own. Already in 1953, Wolfgang Steinitz advocated more direct contact with Soviet and East European scholars, first to learn from their experiences in studying workers' culture, but also as an action of solidarity in their common struggle for peace against aggressive capitalism.[522] Such rhetoric and the mutual East-East gaze intensified around the 1960s and 70s as more and more Russian and Eastern European *Ethnographen* were represented in the *Deutsches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* / *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde und Kulturgeschichte*. At the same time, the GDR began to be included in key Russian introductions to *Ethnographie* (published in German, but also in English, presumably for Western audiences).[523] GDR *Volkskundler* engaged in an Eastward public

---

Democratic Republic, 1955–1965," *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 5, no. 2/3 (1968): 249–66; Heinz Kothe, "Die volkskundliche Forschung und Lehre in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik," *Ethnologia Europaea* 1 (1967): 246–50; Wolfgang Jacobeit, "Intensification of International Cooperation in the Field of European Agrarian Ethnography," *Current Anthropology* 5 (1964): 179–90.

[521] See, for instance, Norbert Riedl, "Contemporary Ethnographic Studies and Research Trends in the German Democratic Republic," in *A Symposium on East European Ethnography*, ed. Zdeněk Salzmann (Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 1970), 65–73. Further research on reception in the West beyond the FRG and US is required.

[522] Steinitz, *Die volkskundliche Arbeit in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, 33. Thus, Steinitz's concluding invocation of a united, democratic Germany as the self same goal for *Volkskunde* as it was one hundred years earlier cannot be read apart from the looming specter of the Cold War.

[523] Julian V. Bromley, ed., *Soviet Ethnology and Anthropology Today* (The Hague: Mouton, 1974); Bromley, *Ethnos und Ethnographie*; Bromley, *Soviet Ethnography*; Akademiia nauk SSSR, *Soviet Studies in Ethnography*, Problems of the Contemporary World 72 (Moscow: Social Sciences Today, USSR Academy of Sciences, 1978).

relations campaign themselves, demonstrating their contributions to Marxist-Leninist cultural research and situating these in a disciplinary history that emphasizes the triumph of the democratic over the bourgeois.[524]

By the thirtieth anniversary of the *Ethnographie / Volkskunde* department at the Humboldt-Universität in 1982, the history of the field's "Neubeginn" (new beginning) in the GDR would be narrated in terms of the successful institutionalization of the Soviet model, both epistemic and organizational.[525] After the turn of the twenty-first century, however, post-*Wende* disciplinary historiography would contradict the self-presentation of a harmonious resonance between GDR and USSR anthropologies by situating the interdisciplinary element of *Volkskunde*'s institutional reforms within the broader context of GDR-FRG international politics and the vicissitudes of East Bloc science. For example, Joachim Petzhold, a historian in the former GDR, explains in his memoir that the joining of *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* as *Ethnographie* was not so much a matter of adapting it to the Soviet model—if that were the case, the full institutional implementation would have been completed sooner—but rather a reaction to political upheavals in West German *Volkskunde* that the SED party functionaries wished to avoid.[526] Beyond the political context, a recent study of Soviet Bloc anthropology points out, the practical issue of language may have been a factor limiting the full conversion of

---

[524] See, for instance, Hermann Strobach, "Der marxistische Volksbegriff und seine Bedeutung für die Bestimmung des Forschungsgegenstandes der Volkskunde," *Ethnographia* 80 (1969): 162–74; Wolfgang Jacobeit, "Zur Geschichte der deutschen Volkskunde," *Acta ethnographica Academiae scientiarum Hungaricae*, 1966, 75–91.

[525] Ute Mohrmann, "Kolloqium 'Dreißig Jahre Ethnographie an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin 1952 bis 1982' am 17.01.1983," *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde und Kulturgeschichte* 27, Neue Folge 12 (1984): 154–56; Wolfgang Jacobeit, "Dreißig Jahre Ethnographie an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin 1952–1982," *Ethnographisch-archäologische Zeitschrift* 27, no. 1 (1986): 13–26.

[526] Joachim Petzold, *Parteinahme wofür?: DDR-Historiker im Spannungsfeld von Politik und Wissenschaft*, ed. Martin Sabrow (Potsdam: Verlag für Berlin-Brandenburg, 2000)., 237.

Volkskunde to the Russian model, as German consistently dominated over Russian as the lingua franca of the scientific communities of the East Bloc.[527]

When one examines disciplinary historiography produced by GDR *Volkskundler* in the late 1980s, another assumption comes into question, namely, that the field completely eschewed the process of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* concerning the Nazi period. While key programmatic statements about disciplinary history did typically align with GDR national historiography by keying in to the founding myth of antifascism, there were a few audacious figures—Wolfgang Jacobeit, Ute Mohrmann, and Hermann Strobach—who engaged *Volkskunde*'s Nazi past, and in international conversation, no less. They even went so far as to examine early GDR *Volkskunde*'s engagement of the Nazi past, thus edging precariously close to the boundary between disciplinary criticism and state criticism.

Already in 1965, Jacobeit had produced his own excavation of *Volkskunde*'s ideological co-option.[528] In many ways this work paralleled the research undertaken simultaneously in Tübingen, but Jacobeit stopped just short of criticizing early GDR-*Volkskundler* for their silence concerning the Nazi period—to do so would be tantamount to implicating the East German state. By the late 1980s, however, Jacobeit broached, if not a critical, then an alternative, more ambivalent view of founding figures Adolf Spamer and Wolfgang Steinitz vis-à-vis *Volkskunde* Nazification and de-Nazification. The discussion began around the time of the 1986 GDR-FRG cultural agreement (*Kulturabkommen*) meant to increase communication and collaboration in education, industry, and the arts, and was conducted under the auspices of an extended research

[527] Chris M. Hann, "Preface," in *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies: Socialist Era Anthropology in East-Central Europe*, ed. Chris M. Hann, Mihály Sárkány, and Peter Skalník (Münster: LIT, 2005), ix.
[528] Jacobeit, *Bäuerliche Arbeit und Wirtschaft: Ein Beitrag zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der deutschen Volkskunde*.

project by West German, East German, Austrian, and US-American scholars concerning the details of *Volkskunde*'s operation under the Nazi regime. Discussed in Part I as part of the third major wave of disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, the project counted Wolfgang Jacobeit as a major contributor alongside Helge Gerndt (Munich), Olaf Bockhorn (Vienna), Hannjost Lixfeld (Freiburg im Breisgau), and James Dow (Iowa State).[529]

In the conferences and essay collections that resulted, including an English edition of selected articles,[530] Jacobeit, as well as Strobach and Mohrmann, examined the details of the political engagements and disengagements of the discipline's historical figures: the Grimms, Riehl, Spamer, and Steinitz. All three authors admit that early GDR *Volkskundler* did not rigorously confront the rupture of National Socialism, yet their interpretation of that nonreaction remains defensive of the founding fathers. Though they present Spamer and Steinitz in a new light—the former as inconsistent in his partisan commitments, the latter perhaps overly committed—the authors ultimately posit both as supremely dedicated to reestablishing the field after the war and to setting it on the right path again.[531] Demonstrating their awareness of disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in the West, they also critically engaged West German evaluations of Nazi-era *Volkskunde*, with the effect of tempering the reactionary, condemnatory tone that dominated the historical criticism in the FRG to that point, on the one hand, and

---

[529] Hannjost Lixfeld even introduces his history of *Volkskunde* under Nazism with an expression of gratitude to Wolfgang Jacobeit. Lixfeld, *Folklore and Fascism*, v.

[530] Gerndt, *Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus*; Jacobeit, Lixfeld, and Bockhorn, *Völkische Wissenschaft*; Dow and Lixfeld, *The Nazification of an Academic Discipline*.

[531] Compare also Wolfgang Jacobeit, "Concerning the Traditional Understanding of 'Folk Culture' in the German Democratic Republic: A Scholarly-Historical Perspective," *Asian Folklore Studies* 50, no. 1 (1991): 67–94.

countering presuppositions that socialist ideology irreversibly blinded GDR *Volkskundler* to the full weight of National Socialism borne by their field, on the other hand.[532]

This remarkable East-West conversation surrounding new understandings of German *Volkskunde*'s Nazi entanglements began shortly before national reunification and dropped off not long thereafter. Indeed, as will be the topic of the next chapter, what appeared to be an increasing rapprochement between FRG and GDR *Volkskunde* would prove illusory as the political realities of the *Wende* played out in academic institutions and scientific communities. Just as a more nuanced, common institutional memory of the field under National Socialism was beginning to materialize, the institutional memory of GDR *Volkskunde* in reunified Germany would quickly fade with the field's restructuring under the West German model.

SUMMARY

In this chapter are assembled clear examples of how the institutional memory of GDR *Volkskunde* was, during the years 1949–1989, formed in tight step with the official cultural discourse of the SED. While there were exceptional cases of criticism—most notably Wolfgang Jacobeit's subversion of party politics—on the whole, *Volkskunde*'s self-narration and institutional structuration were both directed by the state. While the East German discourse on *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* is among the narrative tropes mirrored in *Volkskunde*'s identity discourses, the examples presented also reveal an additional trope of boundaries. That is, the institutional memory of GDR *Volkskunde* is not only circumscribed by the permeable boundary between science and the state, but by

[532] See especially Strobach's criticism of Emmerich's 1968 ideological critique in Strobach, "'. . . aber wann beginnt der Vorkrieg?' Anmerkungen zum Thema Volkskunde und Faschismus (vor und um 1933)." See also Jacobeit's reaction to Wolfgang Brückner's criticisms of GDR *Volkskunde* that introduce his article, Jacobeit, "Auseinandersetzung mit der NS-Zeit in der DDR-Volkskunde," 301–302.

institutional and interdisciplinary boundaries that may be possible to understand on their own terms, as well. The next chapter will examine how, following German reunification, the narratives and structures of GDR *Volkskunde* were and were not translated into an institutional memory that, for a time, excluded or partitioned the East German tradition as a temporary event, external to a continuous Western disciplinary identity.

Chapter 5:

Institutional Memory of East German *Volkskunde*, Reunification to Present

The institutional memory of East German *Volkskunde* formed during the German-German state division was examined in the last chapter in terms of its uneasy mirroring of official communist ideology, but also in terms of how international and interdisciplinary boundaries played a role in the field's formation and narrative identity performances. The present chapter is dedicated to the fate of GDR *Volkskunde* in the field's institutional memory after national reunification. Here, one witnesses another parallel with discourses concerning the state, namely, the trauma of the sudden absorption of East Germany into a West German political, social, economic—and scientific—paradigm. The sources examined in this chapter shed light on the question of what happens to institutional memory when a scientific field's organizational and epistemic structures are summarily dismantled or discarded, and multiple generations of community members must compete to rescue or reconstruct that tradition as part of a complete disciplinary identity.

FROM INSTITUTIONAL AMNESIA TO INSTITUTIONAL MEMORY CONTESTS

In 1988, Wolfgang Kaschuba[533] and Ute Morhmann initiated a joint ethnographic project between young *Volkskundler* at the Ludwig-Uhland Institut für Empirische Kulturwissenschaften and the Ethnographisches Institut (renamed the Institut für Europäische Ethnology shortly after reunification) of the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin that would examine German everyday culture (*Alltagskultur*), identity construction, and East-West German relations and perceptions.[534] In their introduction to the 1992 publication documenting the research results, they observe that the collaboration at first anticipated, but was then suddenly overtaken by a larger national movement, the *Wende*,[535] after 1989. Invoking, and then challenging the terms, metaphors, and stereotypes that had emerged in the last forty-five years to describe East-West German relations,[536] the two-page text, like the project itself, exemplifies the reflexively idealistic,

---

533 In addition to this early ethnographic engagement, as well as his later historiographic engagement with East German *Volkskunde* to be discussed in this chapter, Kaschuba also concerned himself with balancing the contributions of East- and West German scholars while navigating the process of reunification. See Kaschuba, "Kulturalismus: Vom Verschwinden des Sozialen im gesellschaftlichen Diskurs," 27–29.

534 Kaschuba and Mohrmann, *Blick-Wechsel Ost-West*. Although a full exposition is beyond the scope of the present project, it should be noted that former East Germany continues to be a field of ethnographic study in Germany, specifically in the scope of postsocialist studies, but also memory studies and cultural history. See, for instance, Gottfried Korff, "Spione, Hütchenspiele und Banana: Alltags-Symbole und -Metaphern im Prozeß der kulturellen Integration von Ost- und Westdeutschland," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 91, no. 2 (1995): 248–64; Ina Merkel, *"Wir sind doch nicht die Meckerecke der Nation": Briefe an das Fernsehen der DDR* (Berlin: Schwarzkopf & Schwarzkopf, 2000); Tsypylma Darieva, Wolfgang Kaschuba, and Melanie Krebs, eds., *Urban Spaces after Socialism: Ethnographies of Public Places in Eurasian Cities* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2011); Ina Dietzsch, *Grenzen überschreiben?: Deutsch-deutsche Briefwechsel 1949–1989* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2004).

535 "Dann schien die Geschichte unsere Idee jedoch plötzlich zu überholen." ("Then, however, history seemed to suddenly overtake our idea.") Kaschuba and Mohrmann, *Blick-Wechsel Ost-West*, 7.

536 For example, they begin the introduction by referencing Willy Brandt's oft-cited comment concerning reunification—"Es wächst zusammen, was zusammen gehört." ("Now is growing together, that which belongs together.")—in order to challenge the supposition that Germany's long common history is sufficient for overcoming "only" forty-five years of separation. The ethnographic project should demonstrate that, on the level of everyday culture, history is not enough; one cannot simply spring over the fact of separate lived realities, a cultural development so essential for identity. Ibid.

yet critical view of German reunification found in much of the programmatic disciplinary discourse from those early years.[537]

The sweeping restructuring of the East German university and research systems—their institutional formations, personnel and professoriate, curricula and projects—occurred swiftly, and for many, painfully, between 1990 and 1992. Research on the effects of national reunification on East German research academies and universities is ample and growing,[538] and the field of *Volkskunde* is increasingly being added to the list of analyses. This section will not focus on the details of the transition,[539] but rather how *Volkskundler* themselves responded narratively to, and are continuing to represent the dismantling[540] and memory of *Volkskunde* in the GDR.

The years 1990/91 saw a small, but furious flurry of publications concerning the present and future relationship between GDR and FGR *Volkskunde* as the former was begin absorbed into the latter. Also addressed within those discussions was the question

---

[537] As the editors explain in the foreword to the volume, "Was davon abweicht, 'befremdet' uns, es verweist auf ein Anderssein, das wechselseitig stets sehr genau wahrgenommen wurde und wird: auf jenes 'Ihr da drüben.' Auf solchen 'kleinen Unterschieden' im Alltagshabitus bauen die Stereotypen vom 'Ossi' und vom' Wessi' auf. Dieses 'Anderssein'—oder besser: dessen sozialie Wahrnehmung und kulturelle Interpretation—ist das Thema dieses Buchs." Ibid.

[538] Paradigmatic is the edited volume by Jürgen Kocka and Renate Mayntz, *Wissenschaft und Wiedervereinigung: Disziplinen im Umbruch* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1998). Teresa Brinkel offers a further catalog of contributions to this research area, Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*, 198, note 2. Especially relevant, when comparing the case of *Volkskunde*, are treatments of the field of history with which *Volkskunde* was institutionally bound for reasons of disciplinary orientation and of state ideology. See, for instance, Sabrow and Walther, *Historische Forschung und sozialistische Diktatur*; Sabrow, *Verwaltete Vergangenheit*; Martin Sabrow, ed., *Geschichte als Herrschaftsdiskurs: Der Umgang mit der Vergangenheit in der DDR*, Zeithistorische Studien 14 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2000); Sabrow, *Das Diktat des Konsenses*; Petzold, *Parteinahme wofür?*.

[539] The most thorough treatment of the details of the restructuring process can be found in Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*, 197–236.

[540] Teresa Brinkel speaks of the field's "Abwicklung." This was an official term used to describe the whole-scale removal of professors from the East German university system; in order to continue working at a university, one had to reapply along with everyone else (now including West Germans). See Ibid., 199. In his autobiography, Wolfgang Steinitz notes, however, that the term became part of everyday parlance—"und auch wir [GDR *Volkskundler*] gehörten letzten Endes mit zu den Betroffenen." Jacobeit, *Von West nach Ost und zurück*, 227.

of how to understand the field's unique history in the GDR in a time of radical change. The first historiographic reflection on the East German *Volkskunde* and the events leading up to its veritable dissolution was, remarkably, published by staunch anticommunist Wolfgang Brückner.[541] His articles oozing contempt and riddled with the stereotypical vocabulary of the time, Brückner expresses satisfaction that the "ideologische Problematik" (ideological problematics)—affecting both GDR *Volkskundler* and their West German interlocutors—so long swept under the rug now must be laid on the table for all to see.[542] Of a discipline whose institutional and epistemic structures were forty years in the making, he sees nothing worth salvaging.

While Brückner's polemical celebration of the end of GDR *Volkskunde* was a case in the extreme, some East German *Volkskundler*, too, were eager to lay bare the full situation of their field. In former East Germany, most of these discursive performances were produced—and often reflected explicitly on the place of *Volkskunde*—at the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. The essays comprising the 1991 volume, *Geschichte der Völkerkunde und Volkskunde an der Berliner Universität: Zur Aufarbeitung des Wissenschaftserbes*,[543] for instance, tell a story of *Ethnographie* forming as one field in the German Enlightenment, only to be separated into two fields by the ultimately inhumane Romanticism of the nineteenth century. Each saw successes and abuses in the twentieth century, and by 1945 had found their way together again in the GDR.

---

[541] Brückner, "Volkskundler in der DDR"; Brückner, "Nachlese zum Problem der Kulturwissenschaften in der ehemaligen DDR."

[542] Brückner, "Volkskundler in der DDR," 84.

[543] Hannelore Bernhardt, ed., *Geschichte der Völkerkunde und Volkskunde an der Berliner Universität: Zur Aufarbeitung des Wissenschaftserbes*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin 28 (Berlin: Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, 1991). The edited volume includes contributions from Wolfgang Jacobeit and Ute Morhmann, as well as younger East German *Volkskundler* like Thomas Scholze and Leonore Scholze-Irrlitz, who would become leading contributors to the historiography of GDR *Volkskunde* after reunification.

This is how Ute Mohrmann summarizes the text in its foreword: Its narrative arc might have a legitimating effect—documenting the discipline's long tradition in Berlin, for better or for worse, and proposing a future mission for *Volkskunde* at the Humboldt-Universität (already in 1990 reorganized as the Institut für Europäische Ethnologie). Nonetheless, it is not a story of nostalgia or redemption for the GDR. The narrative's impetus comes from the *Wende* and its implications for the field, yet, according to Mohrmann, the historical vignettes presented in the volume were to represent a first round of an ongoing project of critical historiography—a project in institutional memory-making, not a concluding memorial.[544]

Elsewhere, Mohrmann endeavors to prove that "East German *Volkskunde* is thus much more than just disciplinary history" precisely by engaging in disciplinary historiography, focusing especially on the 1950s and 60s.[545] Her treatments typically trace how social-political forces influenced the field, and how *Volkskunde* would play a role in the political system—a reflexive, critical representation unthinkable before reunification. In addition to offering a glimpse into the inner workings of *Volkskunde*

---

[544] As Ute Mohrmann expresses in the foreword, the works and effects of Berlin-based *Volkskundler* and *Völkerkundler* "gehören für die Nachkommenden zur eigenen Wissenschaftsherkunft, die 'Aufhebung' im Sinne einer kritischen Geschichtsschreibung verlangt." Ibid., 5.

[545] "Volkskunde der DDR ist so insgesamt mehr als nur Fachgeschichte." Ute Mohrmann, "Volkskunde in der DDR während der 50er und 60er Jahre—Ein Überblick," in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Volkskunde: Eine Wissenschaft im Widerspruch zwischen Leistung und Versagen*, Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der HU Berlin. Reihe Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften 40.11 (Berlin: Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, 1991), 103; Ute Mohrmann, "Volkskunde in der DDR während der fünfziger und sechziger Jahre," in *Völkische Wissenschaft: Gestalten und Tendenzen der deutschen und österreichischen Volkskunde in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Wolfgang Jacobeit, Hannjost Lixfeld, and Olaf Bockhorn (Vienna: Böhlau, 1994), 375–96; Mohrmann, "Die 'Volkskunde des Neubeginns' während der fünfziger Jahre in der DDR im Kontext damaliger Kulturpolitik," 1991a; Ute Mohrmann, "Die 'Volkskunde des Neubeginns' während der fünfziger Jahre in der DDR im Kontext damaliger Kulturpolitik," in *Beiträge zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Volkskunde im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Kai Detlev Sievers (Neumünster: K. Wachholtz, 1991b), 217–29; Ute Mohrmann, "'roundabout 68'—Zur DDR-Volkskunde Ende der sechziger und während der siebziger Jahre," in *Volkskundliche Tableaus: Eine Festschrift für Martin Scharfe zum 65. Geburtstag von Weggefährten, Freunden und Schülern*, ed. Siegfried Becker (Münster: Waxmann, 2001), 375–84.

under SED political direction, she challenges the notion of GDR *Volkskunde* as "*Neubeginn*," questions Wolfgang Steinitz's vision for the field, describes internal disciplinary conflicts after his death, and laments the negative effects of the field being bounded off or isolated from international disciplinary trends. Such a critical look at the field, now past, is made both easier and harder by her generational proximity to the tradition's founders, she admits. But the "*Aufarbeitung*" of this period is necessary and cannot be put off, especially if one is to avoid falling into the same "*Aufbau*" language used at the foundation of the GDR.[546]

This last sentiment was expressed in an article by Mohrmann for the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*. Her colleagues Hermann Strobach, Thomas Scholze, and Heike Müns, as well as Konrad Köstlin from Tübingen, also contributed pieces concerning *Volkskunde* in the GDR for a special section in the 1991 issue. Strobach covers the history of *Volkskunde* at the AdW, including its dogmatic reorientation upon integration with the history institute and the hampering of research by political suppression.[547] Scholze and Müns, described by Teresa Brinkel as "Vorreiter einer selbstreflexiven Aufarbeitung des ostdeutschen Faches,"[548] cover structures of *Volkskunde* knowledge production around the time of the *Wende*.[549] Meanwhile, Köstlin discusses the prospects for mutual understanding and collaboration between East- and West German *Volkskundler* after reunification. In a situation of sudden and violent upheaval, and rampant prejudice and

---

[546] Mohrmann, "Die 'Volkskunde des Neubeginns' während der fünfziger Jahre in der DDR im Kontext damaliger Kulturpolitik," 1991a, 197.

[547] Hermann Strobach, "Volkskundliche Forschung an der ehemaligen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 87 (1991): 207–24.

[548] "Forerunners of a self-reflexive working-through of the East German field," here adapting Adorno's famous formulation concerning Germany's National Socialist past to the East German case. Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*, 230. Brinkel treats several earlier self-reflexive pieces by Scholze, as well as by Jacobeit and Mohrmann, that are beyond the scope of the present study but merit examination in a planned expanded version of this work.

[549] Heike Müns and Thomas Scholze, "Volkskunde in der DDR. Forschungs- und Ausbildungsstrukturen zur Zeit der 'Wende,'" *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 87 (1991): 84–90.

misunderstanding, Köstlin asks, how are *Volkskundler* supposed to overcome the culture shock and find a new *modus operandi* as a unified scientific community? His answer is to engage in an open, balanced, ongoing dialogue about issues facing the field, historically and presently, from research on the history of the workers' movement to the instrumentalization of culture and cultural sciences for the securing of political power. The exercise should thus recognize diverse positions while seeking common ground for reimagining the field as a whole—creating new, co-constructed historiographic narratives to build a new identity. It is crucial that such debates begin immediately, he insists, "bevor die neuen Mythen überwuchern und ihre Wirklichkeit produzieren, und bevor die total Amnesie ausbricht."[550]

A final push toward critical reflection concerning GDR *Volkskunde* took place at an October 1990 conference on disciplinary historiography organized by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde and hosted by the Seminar für Volkskunde at the Christian-Albrechts-Universität Kiel.[551] This would be the first official common German *Volkskunde* conference coming at the tail end of the *Wende*. Among the presenters from former East Germany were Ute Morhmann, Thomas Scholze, and Sigrid Jacobeit. Jacobeit examines an example of early twentieth-century research which she frames as a "Quelle für eine Ethnographie / Volkskunde des Proletariat." Even her title still reflects the epistemic categories of GDR *Volkskunde*, yet her conclusion connects to the premise of West German disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, that disciplinary

[550] "before new myths overgrow and produce their own reality, and before total amnesia breaks out." Konrad Köstlin, "DDR-Volkskunde: Die Entdeckung einer fernen Welt?," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 87 (1991): 241.

[551] Proceedings published as Sievers, *Beiträge zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Volkskunde im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*.

historiography, including dealing with the baggage of the past, cannot be pursued without reference to the present—and the present situation facing *Volkskunde* is no exception.[552]

Mohrmann's contribution covers the same critical-historical ground she trod in other publications at the time: "Volkskunde des Neubeginns." Unlike those other discursive performances, however, in this case the audience—both former East- and West German *Volkskundler*—was able to answer back. Several commentators challenge her representation of GDR *Volkskunde*'s missed opportunities for more diverse research as being due to overt political circumscription. While not backing down from her argument that science and politics in the GDR were closely enmeshed, she agrees that "auch innerfachlich[e] Gründen," including a (too) close relationship to Soviet *Ethnographie* and Steinitz's influential complicity therein, were to blame for the limitations on the field.[553]

Thomas Scholze, meanwhile, carves a programmatic route in presenting an outline for how the history of GDR *Volkskunde* ought to be remembered. He begins his argument from the premise that, as *Volkskunde* in the FRG and the GDR grew as separate disciplines, the process of reunification would be one of mutual discovery ("Zusammenfindens beider Wissenschaftstypen")—either not yet realizing or implicitly eschewing the reality that one would be practically absorbed into the other. Despite the many challenges the formerly separate scientific communities will likely face in coming together, Scholze presents the process idealistically as an opportunity for cooperation and mutual benefit. Remembering the history of GDR *Volkskunde* would be crucial for a

---

552 "Source for an ethnography / *Volkskunde* of the proletariat." Sigrid Jacobeit, "Die 'Anthropologie der nichtsbesitzenden Klassen' von Alfredo Niceforo (1910) als wissenschaftliche Quelle für eine Ethnographie / Volkskunde des Proletariats," in *Beiträge zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Volkskunde im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Kai Detlev Sievers (Neumünster: K. Wachholtz, 1991), 204–205.

553 "intradisciplinary reasons." Mohrmann, "Die 'Volkskunde des Neubeginns' während der fünfziger Jahre in der DDR im Kontext damaliger Kulturpolitik," 1991b, 228.

successful rapprochement, he argues, but only if the field is understood a) in its full historical context and not just with reference to the present situation of system collapse and b) as not simply as a subfield of history and social science implicated in the social development of the GDR. To that end, he proposes a chronology of the field's development with details that offer a more complex view of *Volkskunde* as a discrete discipline unto itself. Still, he concludes, echoing Mohrmann's lament, that the SED's interference, especially from the late 1960s onward, often reduced the field to a vehicle for political ideology, hindering both autonomy and rationality in GDR *Volkskunde*'s research program.[554]

Beyond these few prominent public articulations, disciplinary discourse concerning GDR *Volkskunde* disappeared as quickly and completely as its institutional formations. A couple of attempts were made at documenting elements of the field's history, but these remained trained on the issue of governmental interference and ideological co-option, framed even in the popular post-*Wende* historiographic trope of socialist dictatorship.[555] The radio silence of discourse on GDR *Volkskunde* likely reflects a shift of focus to questions of survival on the part of former East German *Volkskundler* as individuals hoping to continue their careers in the field;[556] the fleeting hope for another "Neubeginn," this time for former GDR *Volkskundler* to resume their work as usual, had

---

554 Thomas Scholze, "Thesen für einen Abriss zur Geschichte der Volkskunde in der DDR," in *Beiträge zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Volkskunde im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Kai Detlev Sievers (Neumünster: K. Wachholtz, 1991), 241. See also Scholze, "Adolf Spamer (1883–1953)—Wissenschaftsgrundsätze."

555 Kehl, "Zur Etablierung der marxistisch-leninistischen Volkskunde am Zentralinstitut für Geschichte"; You Jae Lee, "Volkskunde in der DDR zwischen innovativen Methoden und politischer Einbindung 1963–1974" (Magisterarbeit am Fachbereich Geschichtswissenschaften, Freie Universität Berlin, 1998). Lee's thesis was written under preeminent GDR historian Jürgen Kocka. Wolfgang Jacobeit viewed the work, however, as exemplary of a historiography that dismisses the real contributions of GDR *Volkskunde*.

556 See Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*, 226.

been swiftly quashed by the processes of "*Abwicklung*" (closing down) and evaluation of university departments.[557]

For former West German *Volkskundler*, meanwhile, beyond the anxiety over mutual misunderstanding that Köstlin invoked, the realization was setting in that they, in fact, only had a limited understanding of the field as it was practiced and lived in the GDR.[558] As a result of these cumulative processes, the balanced dialogue that Köstlin prescribed failed to materialize. The top-down restructuring of the field once again circumscribed historiography of GDR *Volkskunde*, as a narrative of disciplinary continuity continued to isolate the field's forty years of practice in the GDR.[559] This time, lacking a common historical narrative, any hope of establishing an institutional memory encompassing both traditions seemed to be dashed.

By the turn of the twenty-first century, however, the temporary institutional amnesia surrounding GDR *Volkskunde* began to lift with a new wave of historiography. Among the first to resurrect the narrative were members of the Berlin Gesellschaft für Ethnographie e.V. (GfE). Founded by East German *Volkskundler* (Wolfgang Jacobeit and Thomas Scholze, among them) in April 1990 and still functioning today,[560] the

---

[557] For the details of this process, see Ibid., 198–224.

[558] Ibid., 230.

[559] See, for instance, the sequestering of GDR *Volkskunde* in the third edition (2003) of Weber-Kellermann's introduction to the field (*Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie*.) and in Wolfgang Kaschuba's *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*. (1999, 2003, 2006). Even Wolf Brednich, despite making some changes to the original edition to reflect political changes in Germany and Eastern Europe, still gives relative short shrift to GDR *Volkskundler*, including mentioning only West German publications as the main introductions to the field. Brednich, *Grundriß der Volkskunde*, 8, 563. This trend can also be found in *Völkerkunde* historiography. See, for instance, Gingrich, "The German-Speaking Countries"; Haller, *Die Suche nach dem Fremden*. But where Haller diplomatically states that the East German tradition, like the Austrian and the Swiss, is beyond the scope of his focus on developments in West Germany, Gingrich "make[s] it absolutely clear that the dominant development of the GDR's social and historical sciences was ideological distortion at the service of the regimes in East Berlin and Moscow" (147).

[560] See the organization's homepage, http://www.gfe-online.org/cms2/index.php/index.html. See also Martina Krause et al., *Ethnografisches Arbeiten in Berlin: Wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Annäherungen* (Münster: LIT, 2003).

organization sought to continue pursuing anthropological research built on the methodological kinship between *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* institutionalized in the GDR. Brinkel describes the GfE as the first attempt at an institutionalized, broad debate about the field. Established in the wake of GDR *Volkskunde*'s dismantling in an environment of anxiety over survival, it also offered an independent, new structure to which to transfer the field's institutional memory.

In 2001, on the occasion of Wolfgang Jacobeit's eightieth birthday, the GfE published a volume in its organ, the *Berliner Blätter*, that presented a retrospective mosaic of conversations and essays about GDR *Volkskunde* from its foundation to the *Wende*.[561] The first section contains reprintings of interviews and correspondences that took place under the auspices of the GfE concerning the fate of GDR *Volkskunde* and its legacy after the *Wende*. The second section comprises historiographic articles, including biographical sketches of key figures Pawoł Nedo and Wolfgang Steinitz. The final section examines present issues in the field. On the one hand, it concerns the institutional afterlife of GDR *Volkskunde* in the current situation of the field at former East German universities. On the other hand, prominent department heads from across the country debate the pressing questions facing *Europäische Ethnologie*, acknowledging that the field still has a ways to go to prove its worth as a globalized discipline studying globalizing culture. Taken as a whole, then, the work establishes the East German tradition as an object of disciplinary historiography unto itself, and with that, as part of the heritage, both of the GfE and of contemporary *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* in general.

---

[561] Scholze and Scholze-Irrlitz, *Zehn Jahre Gesellschaft für Ethnographie—Europäische Ethnologie in Berlin*.

The first decade of the twenty-first century also saw an opening for former GDR *Volkskundler* to discuss their field as part of an East Bloc tradition. Fifteen years after the fall of Soviet Communism, the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology at Halle sponsored a study on the various national traditions of East and Central European anthropology under socialism,[562] with Ute Mohrmann and Wolfgang Jacobeit writing on behalf of East Germany.[563] By viewing "a corner of recent disciplinary history which remains poorly understood even in the countries concerned"[564] within the overarching framework of Soviet Cold War politics, the study offers new insight into the interplay of socialist ideology, power, and cultural science—both the commonalities at the regional geopolitical level and the differences at the local national levels.[565]

The volume's editors are careful to note that all the traditions represented, though officially defunct, are "still very much alive and . . . at multiple levels 'essentially contested.'"[566] While the project does not claim to offer a comprehensive, intercountry comparison yielding unified interpretations, the authors conclude with an observation common to most studies of postsocialism: "There can be no tabula rasa in the specialized communities of the academic world, any more than there can ever be a completely fresh

---

562 Chris M. Hann, Mihály Sárkány, and Peter Skalník, eds., *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies: Socialist Era Anthropology in East-Central Europe* (Münster: LIT, 2005).

563 Wolfgang Jacobeit, "The Genesis of Volkskunde in the German Democratic Republic," in *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies: Socialist Era Anthropology in East-Central Europe*, ed. Chris M. Hann, Mihály Sárkány, and Peter Skalník (Münster: LIT, 2005), 184–89; Ute Mohrmann, "Volkskunde in the German Democratic Republic on the Eve of Its Dissolution," in *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies: Socialist Era Anthropology in East-Central Europe*, ed. Chris M. Hann, Mihály Sárkány, and Peter Skalník (Münster: LIT, 2005), 195–209.

564 Hann, Sárkány, and Skalník, *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies*, 15.

565 A similar research endeavor was being undertaken at the same time at the University of Vienna Institut für Europäische Ethnologie, where Konrad Köstlin and Peter Niedermüller organized a conference in 1999 on the topic of the effects of the events of 1989 on other European Ethnologies, in particular those of Central and Eastern Europe. In that case, the focus was both historiographic and presentist, as participants took the ten-year anniversary of the fall of Communism to reflect on the present state and future prospects of the field in Europe. Konrad Köstlin and Herbert Nikitsch, eds., *Die Wende als Wende: Orientierungen Europäischer Ethnologien nach 1989* (Vienna: Verlag des Instituts für Europäische Ethnologie, 2002).

566 Hann, Sárkány, and Skalník, *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies*, 1.

start in the life of any human society." As a continuation in the *Aufarbeitung* of the GDR *Volkskunde*'s past, the project was a forum for Mohrmann and Jacobeit to examine the beginning and the end of the field in a way that "acknowledge[s] deficits but also many reputable achievements," and "recognize[s] the ultimate contingency of this disciplinary history."[567]

Indeed, the 2000s saw a movement of GDR *Volkskunde* historiography not only out of silence, but also out of anxious self-criticism typical of East German intellectuals in the early years of reunification,[568] and into a space allowing for greater ambiguity and nuance. This narrative shift gathered steam with the publication of several biographies and autobiographies of prominent East German *Volkskundler*. For present purposes, we will treat three monographs concerning three figures: Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, Wolfgang Steinitz, and Wolfgang Jacobeit.[569] Across these publications, a common theme appears, namely, the representation of these figures as "Grenzgänger"—boundary

---

[567] Ibid., 18.

[568] Regarding the tenor and urgency of criticism in and of the East German intellectual sphere, one thinks immediately of the deutsch-deutscher Literaturstreit. That debate commenced when West German critics accused East German author Christa Wolf of hypocrisy for suggesting in her book *Was bleibt*, written in the late 70s but only published in 1990, that she was a victim of the Stasi despite being a member of the SED and, it was revealed in 1993, an *inoffizieller Mitarbeiter*. That critique of Wolf quickly was extended to all of GDR literature, recalling the familiar debate over exile literature and inner emigration in the early postwar years. See Thomas Anz, *"Es geht nicht um Christa Wolf": Der Literaturstreit im vereinten Deutschland* (Munich: Edition Spangenberg, 1991); K. Stuart Parkes, *Writers and Politics in Germany, 1945–2008*, Studies in German Literature, Linguistics, and Culture (Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2009), 145–163.

[569] Besides the article-length biographies of Steinitz and Nedo that appear in Scholze and Scholze-Irrlitz, *Zehn Jahre Gesellschaft für Ethnographie—Europäische Ethnologie in Berlin*., see the biography of Paul Nedo: Annett Bresan, *Pawoł Nedo: 1908–1984. Ein biografischer Beitrag zur sorbischen Geschichte* (Bautzen: Domowina-Verlag, 2002). See also the 2006 essay collection on the life and work of Wolfgang Steinitz, which includes reprinting of several of his speeches to the SED Zentralkomitee: Steinitz and Kaschuba, *Wolfgang Steinitz: Ich hatte unwahrscheinliches Glück*. Also, consider the *Festschriften* for Wolfgang Jacobeit and Ute Mohrmann: Wolfgang Jacobeit and Wolfgang Kaschuba, *Alltagskultur im Umbruch: Festschrift für Wolfgang Jacobeit zu seinem 75. Geburtstag* (Weimar: Böhlau, 1996); Dagmar Neuland-Kitzerow and Ute Mohrmann, eds., *Akteure—Praxen—Theorien: Der Ethnografin Ute Mohrmann zum siebzigsten Geburtstag* (Münster: LIT, 2010)., as well as the posthumous Steinitz *Festschrift*: John Eckhard and Wolfgang Steinitz, *Die Entdeckung des sozialkritischen Liedes: Zum 100. Geburtstag von Wolfgang Steinitz* (Münster: Waxmann, 2006).

figures performing a balancing act on the edge between two fields that index distinct and opposing social, political, and scientific positionalities.

Of the three individuals, Weber-Kellermann was perhaps the most literal "Grenzgängerin," and was identified precisely as such in multiple biographical and autobiographical sources.[570] She began her studies with Spamer, lived in West Berlin, but worked in East Berlin at the AdW until 1960 when she left to complete her studies and then take up a professorship in Marburg. She died in 1993, but her autobiographical reflections, written in 1991 and entitled "Erinnern und Vergessen" (remembering and forgetting), were published posthumously by her students and collaborators Siegfried Becker and Andreas C. Bimmer, on the occasion of what would have been her eightieth birthday.[571]

Weber-Kellermann's memories of her time working in the SBZ and GDR include devoted defense of her mentor Spamer, honest skepticism about the reasons Steinitz was installed as his successor, but also sympathy for a man she regarded as "energetic" and "noble," but whose politics got in the way. Her double life between East and West was difficult, financially and ideologically, especially after the 1948 Berlin Blockade. Things worsened when Stalin died in 1953: with social pressure to move East mounting, she began looking for job opportunities in the FRG. She had not internalized the black-and-white outlook of Adenauer Era and the Cold War, she remembers, but rather "saß, wie gesagt, zwischen den Stühlen."[572]

---

[570] Weber-Kellermann, Becker, and Bimmer, *Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann*; Angelika Kuhlmann, "Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, 1918–1993," *Jahrbuch für Volksliedforschung* 39 (1994): 139–40; Gaugele, "Von Zeiten und Zeichen."

[571] Weber-Kellermann, Becker, and Bimmer, *Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann*.

[572] "sat, like I said, between the chairs." Ibid., 25.

But even once she secured a place at Marburg, completing her *Habilitation* under Gerhard Heilfurth, she still encountered professional difficulties, now from the other side of the political-ideological divide. Not only had she absorbed a more sociological research orientation that contrasted with the folkloric profile of the Marburg institute, but some colleagues regarded her as a "red" from the East. Her status as a woman in a male-dominated profession, however, seemed to be the greatest hindrance to her advancement in the West. Thus, the real turning point in her career, she recalls, was not leaving the East, but rather the student movement and subsequent reforms surrounding 1968.[573] For both her connection to the GDR and her political liberalism in the West, Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann would even be cast as "die rote Weber" ("red Weber") in some corners of disciplinary historiography.[574]

The problem of politics hindering job prospects, East and West, is also a driving theme in Wolfgang Jacobeit's 2000 autobiography. Entitled *Von West nach Ost und zurück: Autobiographisches eines Grenzgängers zwischen Tradition und Novation*,[575] Jacobeit's account of GDR *Volkskunde* and his role in it is a mixture of scientific documentation—charting the major theoretical and methodological milestones he helped to forward—and historical criticism of the politicization of knowledge production. For instance, he situates his choice to move to the GDR in 1956, only three years after the *Volksaufstand*, as motivated by a sincere desire to pursue a career in *Volkskunde* at a time when his personal political leanings (vaguely leftist) and specific research area (workers' culture, following his mentor Will-Erich Peuckert) would prevent him from getting a job in the still highly conservative Western branch of the field.[576]

---

[573] Ibid.
[574] Gaugele, "Von Zeiten und Zeichen," 81.
[575] Jacobeit, *Von West nach Ost und zurück*.
[576] Ibid., 89–91.

Throughout the narrative Jacobeit offers ample, poignant examples of state interference in the progress of science,[577] noting that, while he was averse to participating in party politics, he was nonetheless politically aware. Reminiscent of Volker Braun's capitalized keywords in *Die unvollendete Geschichte* (1977), the text is peppered with GDR terminology set off by quotation marks. The overarching theme of being a boundary figure—part of the book's title—captures how Jacobeit sees his experience as being caught between polar forces. This position sometimes benefitted him—for instance, by allowing him to maintain connections to international anthropology—but also led to hardship, as he was sanctioned and threatened by Stasi for refusing to go with the flow.[578] At the same time, Jacobeit presents his role in navigating the SED-directed institutional reforms of the 1960s/70s as a kind of mediator—a positive memory. He advocated greater collaboration with the historians and the *Völkerkundler*; it was the politicization of interdisciplinarity that caused him personal strife and the discipline scientific erosion.

Jacobeit's frustration over state interference preventing him from reaching his professional goal of achieving an interdisciplinary "critical *Volkskunde*" rising above standard Marxist-Leninist theory is superseded, however, by his frustration over the outcome of reunification for his field. In his description of the *Wende*, one sees a clear parallel drawn between the fate of GDR *Volkskunde* and the fate of the GDR as a nation—both occupied and then absorbed by the West. Attempts to capitalize on his connections to certain *Volkskundler* in the West came to nothing, and ultimately—as his title indicates—he ended up back in the FRG, as if his time in the East amounted to

[577] See, for instance, Ibid., 99–100, 116–119, 120–121, 136, 149.
[578] Ibid., 120–121.

nothing as the innovations he spearheaded were excluded from institutional memory, or worse, credited to others in the West.[579]

The book's epilogue amplifies the boundary-figure trope as well as the sense that Jacobeit, through no fault of his own, was together with the GDR on the losing side of the Cold War. He sees his autobiography as contributing to—or, it seems, correcting—postreunification disciplinary historiography, but he shies away from making explicit comments about the state of public history more broadly, except to say that he is as skeptical of those who prospered during the regime only to confess their regrets after as colleagues "von drüben" are skeptical of his seeming attempt at a self-defense. The only regret he has was putting career over family, which drove him to move to and stay in the GDR.[580] In the end, he invokes Pierre Nora's thought on the relationship between autobiography and historiography: one must treat one's story as one would the story of another person. It is then up to the reader to judge whether personal memory is accurate and historical understanding is deepened.[581]

Unable to tell his own story of GDR *Volkskunde* after the *Wende* was the founding figure, Wolfgang Steinitz, who died in 1967 at age 62. However, he had left a substantial personal archive of reflective writings, as well as unpublished interviews with him, his family, and colleagues. In 2005, historian Annette Leo published a biography of Steinitz based on those materials.[582] Though her subject was dead, his memory was still very much alive and the author was challenged to represent Steinitz's life accurately while also satisfying the vision of the still living and highly invested interviewees. Leo's solution would be to take a heretofore underexamined aspect of his life—his Jewish

[579] Ibid., 155, 227–236.
[580] Ibid., 260–263.
[581] Ibid., 267–268.
[582] Leo, *Leben als Balance-Akt*.

identity—as the narrative pivot point for explaining his philosophy and his fate as a communist and a cultural researcher. From his youth to the founding of the GDR, Steinitz experienced persecution and exile, which in turn informed his intellectual rigor and spirit of social and political activism. The biographer treats in tandem the emergence of Steinitz's political consciousness and the awakening of his theoretical thinking about culture, and draws connections between key milestones or poignant memories of his life up to 1945 and his leadership of *Volkskunde* in the GDR thereafter.

When the narrative arrives at "Rückkehr und Gründerzeit," the period 1946 to 1950 when Steinitz returns to Germany from a multicountry wartime exile, Leo delves into the conditions that set the stage for Steinitz's rise to power in GDR *Volkskunde* and the SED, resting heavily on the connection he established to the Soviet Union while exiled there. At the same time, she draws forward examples that suggest Steinitz's conscience was fundamentally humanist, beyond the limits of political ideology.[583] But while the early years of his time in the GDR come across as a sunny period, the boundary trope—specifically, the metaphor of balancing act—would be invoked when describing his life from the early 1950s onward. While the myriad shorter post-*Wende* accounts of Steinitz's professional life emphasize the precarious line he somehow diplomatically trod between scientific autonomy and the state, Leo mobilizes the details of the ample records available to her to form a narrative that raises to memory the deep personal roots and more intimate expressions of Steinitz's inner objections and articulated resistance to the direction and demands of an increasingly repressive Communist state, leaving no room for ambivalence concerning the true nobleness of his character. This work inspired a

[583] See, for instance, Ibid., 236.

number of multidisciplinary colloquia at which researchers scrutinized the details and debated the significance of Wolfgang Steinitz in disciplinary history.[584]

Interest in the historiography of GDR *Volkskunde* has by now spread beyond those who experienced the field themselves—members of the first generation, like Wolfgang Jacobeit, and the second generation, like Leonore Scholze-Irrlitz—to what might be called a "third generation"[585] of scholars. This last cohort may be described as having no personal memories of GDR *Volkskunde*—and perhaps only childhood memories of divided Germany—but having been socialized into a scientific community with a particular institutional memory (and amnesia) concerning the East German tradition. For this reason, it is not surprising when certain enduring tropes, like the problematic relationship between science and the state, still tend to frame the most recent historiographic narratives. On the other hand, given the "third generation's" age distance from GDR *Volkskunde* and from the GDR itself, their investments in how the field is remembered differ from those of the first and second generations. Their positionality may, in fact, yield a kind of institutional *postmemory* formed at the interface of public memory of the GDR and the institutional memory of GDR *Volkskunde*.

Among the young scholars examining GDR *Volkskunde* are Cornelia Kühn, Blanka Koffer, and Teresa Brinkel. Kühn, presently a research assistant (*Wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin*) at the Institut für Europäische Ethnologie at the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, has published on the popularization of science in the

---

584 Contributions to this newly enlivened research area are collected in the 2006 volume, Steinitz and Kaschuba, *Wolfgang Steinitz: Ich hatte unwahrscheinliches Glück*.

585 Studies of the GDR's "third generation" have grown up around a transnational network of young scholars—members of that generation themselves—who are interested in exploring issues of memory and intergenerational difference regarding life in East Germany. Studies in this area include Heß, *Geschichte als Politikum: Öffentliche und private Kontroversen um die Deutung der DDR-Vergangenheit*. For additional authors and sources on this topic, see the websites of the Dritte Generation Ostdeutschland research groups: http://netzwerk.dritte-generation-ost.de/ and https://thirdgenerationost.wordpress.com/.

socialist context. Taking early GDR *Volkskunde* and *Heimatkunde* as her case study, she shifts the boundary trope from science and the state, to science and the public.[586] Blanka Koffer, a doctoral student at the Institut für Geschichtswissenschaften at the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin,[587] has published an oral history study on the everyday worklife of GDR *Volkskundler* and *Ethnographen*, before and after the *Wende*.[588] While Teresa Brinkel's first publication on the history GDR *Volkskunde* relies heavily on the classic tropes of state and science, continuity issues, and *unbewältigte Vergangenheit* in the field's foundation, her 2012 dissertation, written at the Institute für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie at the University of Göttingen, presents the first comprehensive study of the institutional structures and paradigm shifts of GDR *Volkskunde*, set in geopolitical context.

All three authors employ insights from—and in turn contribute to—the interdisciplinary field of history of GDR science,[589] but also to the emerging field of postsocialist studies.[590] To understand the relationship between science and the state, all three hit upon Mitchell Ash's concept of "resource ensembles"[591] as a means of

---

[586] Kühn, Nikolow, and Schirrmacher, "'...eine neue, mit dem Volks verbundene Kultur entwickeln'—Laienkunst als Ressource für die Etablierung der Volkskunde in der frühen DDR"; Kühn, "Sozialistische Wissenschaftspopularisierung: Volkskunde und Heimatgeschichte in der frühen DDR."

[587] In December 2014, Koffer defended her dissertation (*Promotion*), "Kulturanalyse und Kulturarbeit. Volkskunde an den Akademien der Wissenschaften der DDR und CSSR nach 1972."

[588] Blanka Koffer, "Wissenschaftliche Arbeit im Wandel am Beispiel der DDR-Volkskunde nach 1989," in *Flexible Biografien?: Horizonte und Brüche im Arbeitsleben der Gegenwart*, ed. Manfred Seifert (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2007), 215–26; Blanka Koffer, "(Post-)Sozialistischer Arbeitsalltag in den Geisteswissenschaften am Beispiel der Ethnographie in der DDR," in *Erinnerungen nach der Wende: Oral History und (post)sozialistische Gesellschaften*, ed. Julia Obertreis and Anke Stephan (Essen: Klartext, 2009), 345–57.

[589] Particularly representative are Sabrow, *Das Diktat des Konsenses*; Kocka and Mayntz, *Wissenschaft und Wiedervereinigung*; Andreas Malycha, ed., *Geplante Wissenschaft: Eine Quellenedition zur DDR-Wissenschaftsgeschichte 1945-1961* (Leipzig: Akademische Verlagsanstalt, 2003).

[590] They cite, for instance, Chris M. Hann, *Postsocialism: Ideals, Ideologies, and Practices in Eurasia* (London: Routledge, 2002); Michał Buchowski, *Rethinking Transformation: An Anthropological Perspective on Post-Socialism* (Poznań: Humaniora, 2001).

[591] Ash, "Wissenschaft und Politik als Ressourcen für einander."

describing the establishment of *Volkskunde* in the GDR and the field's restructuring at the *Wende* as "neither the seamless continuation of the past nor a new beginning from a zero point."[592] Of the three, Brinkel's study best demonstrates the implications of generational distance for the institutional memory of GDR *Volkskunde*.

Like Wolfgang Jacobeit, Brinkel professes a wish to fill in a gap in disciplinary historiography—to recover the institutional memory of GDR *Volkskunde* for the field post-reunification. She recognizes that, while a good deal of new research on the topic has been produced in the last decade, the story is still dominated by those who lived it—an observation similar to Timothy Scott Brown's concerning the historiography of Germany's "1968." But positioned as she was, as a doctoral student, trained in reunified Germany whose most direct connection to GDR *Volkskunde* is being a *Volkskundler* herself, Brinkel was frequently challenged by interviewees concerning her ability to get the story right—in other words, their view of the history. In order to meet the challenge of undertaking the ethnography of experts who were effectively traumatized by the disappearance and forgetting of their field, she makes the typical postmodern move of constructing a multivocal narrative that, at times, is more mosaic than factual description.

This narrative strategy comes across clearly in her description of what happened to *Volkskunde* in the GDR around the time of reunification. The chapter title "Umbruch [upheaval] 1989/90—Fragmente zur Geschichte einer Abwicklung"[593] clearly anticipates a story of traumatic rupture, and the interviews, policy statements, statistics, and so on included here create a fragmented picture of fracture, as promised. When it comes to the perspectives of witnesses to the event, Brinkel juxtaposes patterns of perception with

[592] "weder [die] bruchlose Fortsetzung des Vergangenen noch als Neuanfang von einem Nullpunkt." Brinkel, *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR*, 11.
[593] Ibid., 197–236.

numbers and lists to reinforce her interpretation that the "*Mauer im Kopf*" (Wall in the mind) still persists for both sides, and that one's memory depends heavily on what happened to a person after reunification. For instance, East German *Volkskundler* of the first generation often insisted that the university reform process was dominated by mistrustful functionaries from the West who, then naturally, laid off all but a few GDR *Volkskundler*. Yet, as Brinkel demonstrates with straightforward lists of names and numbers, the ratios were not as dire as they seemed and other factors were at play.

Still, that sense of exclusion was confirmed by the failing or lack of attempts at bridging FRG and GDR *Volkskunde*. But even on that count, Brinkel presents published evidence that the reasons for this were not necessarily due to prejudiced assumptions that GDR *Volkskundler* were all too "*staatsnah*" (close to the state) to be capable of good scholarship, but rather that West German *Volkskundler* realized that their relationship to, and understanding of GDR *Volkskunde* was in fact extremely limited. Having underestimated how dire the situation was and how great GDR Volkskundler's anxiety over professional survival would be, the West Germans felt unprepared to deal with the field as a whole and feared communication would deteriorate into stereotypes and suspicions. Brinkel concludes the chapter by describing the contours of *Volkskunde*'s residual "*Mauer im Kopf*": "Die aus der Wende resultierenden Verletzungen, aber auch die Enttäuschungen darüber, dass die Leistungen der DDR-Volkskunde heute kaum mehr erwähnt werden, markieren die Grenzen der gesamtdeutchen Wissenschaftsdisziplin."[594]

When one compares Brinkel's narrative with Wolfgang Jacobeit's autobiography and Leo's biography of Wolfgang Steinitz, one can see how the historiography of GDR

[594] "The injuries resulting from the *Wende*, but also from frustrations over how the achievements of GDR *Volkskunde* are hardly ever referred to today, mark the boundaries of the whole discipline in Germany." Ibid., 236. This sentiment was also raised by certain interviewees: both by those who had experience in GDR *Volkskunde* and so shared that frustration, and by those without that experience who nonetheless were struck by the lack of knowledge about that tradition in the field today.

Volkskunde is presently at the meeting point of memory and postmemory. This particular node of competing memories requires an ethics of reflexivity for dealing with narrative forms that cross memoir, biography, ethnography, and historiography. But while Brinkel approaches the prospect of institutional memory contests between generations as an ethical issue resolvable through multivocality, she does not demonstrate as much reflexivity about the implications of her use of narrative tropes drawn from both institutional memory and public memory of the GDR (e.g., "*Abwicklung*," "*Mauer im Kopf*"). These terms might even speak to a dynamics of "institutional postmemory" whereby a new generation of German *Volkskundler* attempts to reincorporate GDR *Volkskunde* into institutional memory, bridging a generational gap characterized by caesura in order to overcome the (actual and perceived) deafness for witnesses' voices, as well as the scientific community's "*Mauer im Kopf*." Still, to use these tropes of GDR historiography unreflectively could also limit possibilities for alternative interpretations.

In a time when the first, second, and third generations—the second two of which identify more with West than East—are simultaneously trying to preserve or recover East German *Volkskunde* in institutional memory, a notion of institutional postmemory would require further nuancing if it were to be applied in this case. For now, it may be more appropriate to speak with the more familiar scholarly term of "German memory contests,"[595] but applied to a specialist field. What the precise implications of this attempt at recovering GDR *Volkskunde* in the field's institutional memory will be for disciplinary structure and identity cannot yet be known. Still, as Silke Arnold-de Simine and Susannah Radstone recently mused: "If one thing is clear, it is surely that under the

[595] Though not used exclusively by these authors, the notion of German memory contests is mobilized, for instance, in Fuchs, Cosgrove, and Grote, *German Memory Contests*.

pressure of the European present, memories of the GDR [or GDR *Volkskunde*] will continue to be revised."[596]

One of the latest historiographic revisitings of East German *Volkskunde* came with the 2013 meeting of the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde*. The theme for the conference was "Zur Situation der Volkskunde 1945–1970: Orientierungen einer Wissenschaft in Zeiten des 'Kalten Krieges.'"[597] In covering the first twenty-five years of the field's post–World War II recovery, the papers presented there gathered the West German and the East German narratives together. The presentations on the East German tradition—discussing Pawoł Nedo, Wolfgang Jacobeit, the Sorbisches Institut in Bautzen, interdisciplinarity and paradigm shifts in GDR *Volkskunde*, and relations between East- and West German *Volkskundler* up to the early 1960s—exemplify how the trope of boundaries has provided a pathway to incorporating the East German story into a common institutional memory.

SUMMARY

The tropes and timing of the discursive identity performances examined in this chapter echo Regina Bendix's recent observation that "more than twenty years have passed since German reunification in 1990, but a coming to terms both with the divided disciplinary history and the former East's very speedy incorporation into the West is slow in coming."[598] The translation of *Volkskunde*'s institutional memory across the rupture of German reunification is still ongoing, but, as we have seen in the most recent publications, that discursive caesura is beginning to be filled even when the East German

[596] Arnold-de Simine and Radstone, "The GDR and the Memory Debate," 31.
[597] Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, "Zur Situation der Volkskunde 1945-1970: Orientierungen einer Wissenschaft in Zeiten des 'Kalten Krieges.'" Ludwig Maximilian Universität München, 09.–11.5.2013."
[598] Bendix, "From 'Volkskunde' to the 'Field of Many Names,'" 374–375.

epistemic and organizational structures cannot be recovered. Indeed, this is precisely the challenge: how will the East German tradition fit into institutional memory when its structures have disappeared? This question is at present still a matter of institutional memory contests between the still-living founders, their students who remained in the profession, and a "third generation" of *Volkskundler* interested in reclaiming this history, but without the personal investment and emotional response of those who lived it.

Across Part II, we have seen how the case of East German *Volkskunde* bears certain resonances with the analysis of translations of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in the West German institutional memory. In both cases, we witness how the boundary between science and the state demands certain translations of disciplinary history: in Part I, this was a matter of overcoming the field's past under National Socialism, in Part II, it was a matter of how *Volkskunde* negotiated its identity, past and present, to meet the demands of a new authoritarian state. The impact of the *Wende* on *Volkskunde*'s institutional memory, though at first seeming to be a tragic case of institutional amnesia vis-à-vis the East German tradition, is finally being taken up as a problem in disciplinary historiography much in the way the complex problems surrounding reunification are being reintroduced in German public discourse.

But beyond the boundary between science and the state, we have seen how boundaries with other specialist communities—interdisciplinary and international—form an additional trope of institutional memory. Indeed, as Part III will explore, it may be that Germany's *Volkskunde* has come to a point in its postwar history where an alternative, overarching trope of boundaries could supplant the preoccupation with the implications of past state interventions and usher in new structural forms, especially as the field adjusts its identity narrative to confront new pressures on its integrity.

PART III:

BOUNDARIES AS A LATENT AND EMERGENT TROPE OF *VOLKSKUNDE*'S INSTITUTIONAL MEMORY

Common to the diverse approaches to the history and sociology of science described in the "Study Frameworks" chapter is the implication that the establishment and maintenance of boundaries between fields is a driving element of disciplinary development. Thomas Kuhn, for example, though not speaking explicitly in terms of interdisciplinary boundaries, bases his model of scientific revolutions in the natural sciences on the notion that "competition between a number of distinct views of nature" eventually solidifies in paradigms around which a subscribing scientific community gathers, forming the grounds for the "tradition-bound activity of normal science."[599]

Some social theorists dissent from this position. Pierre Bourdieu, for example, argues that the emphasis on competition is too focused on economic capital.[600] But, as the next two chapters will argue, the case of Germany's *Volkskunde*—West-, East-, and reunified—exemplifies just how important establishing, defending, and traversing

[599] Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 4–6.

[600] Bourdieu argues further that all scientific competition (between universities, researchers, etc.) still occurs within the limits of field's particular orthodoxy. Bourdieu, "The Specificity of the Scientific Field," 44.

boundaries with neighboring scientific fields is, not simply for securing scarce resources, but for affirming the independent existence of a field that was institutionally legitimated through its appropriation in National Socialist ideology, and then *de*legitimated immediately thereafter for precisely the same reason.

To this point, the study has focused on how one particular boundary trope—the boundary between science and the state—tends to dominate *Volkskunde*'s institutional memory. It has done so by tracing postwar translations of the broader public discourse of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* into and across changing disciplinary identity narratives, and the effects thereof on transformations in the field's knowledge and organizational structures. Part III of the dissertation will look beyond the boundary of the previously explicated problems arising from the ideologically fraught histories of German national boundaries to consider *Volkskunde*'s external *disciplinary* boundaries, on the one hand, and emerging public discourses concerning supranational developments in *European* politics and culture.

The following two chapters will recast the trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*—dealing with the fraught legacy of the National Socialist state and later, some argue, the East German state—as one of several interacting boundary issues comprising *Volkskunde*'s postwar institutional memory. On the one hand, these two chapters will recursively revisit two interrelated boundary issues—namely, interdisciplinary and international relations with other scientific fields—that manifested themselves across the preceding analysis and which are at the core of today's thought on disciplinarity. At the same time, the analysis will raise to visibility additional sites of institutional memory that point to boundaries beyond the science and the German state(s), but that were either overshadowed by, or assumed into, the trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, or else are presently emerging beyond the confines of Germany's Nazi past. In this way it will be

shown that, while the field certainly engaged its specialist neighbors—either to distinguish itself from them, or to draw upon them to construct a new identity—as a means of dealing with the National Socialist past, concern with boundaries also extends beyond that preoccupation.

As an entry into explicating the network of external boundary issues for postwar *Volkskunde*, Part III first recapitulates the translations of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*—how the field negotiates the boundary between science and, in this case, a fraught state apparatus—that were traced through the preceding chapters of this study. To reiterate: the root of the problem of institutional memory for postwar *Volkskunde* was the translation of the field's core concepts from the interwar period by the Nazi regime into an added layer of cultural propaganda to compliment its racial ideology. In attempting to reclaim its legitimacy—or rather, to begin establishing a legitimate disciplinary identity apart from its Nazi sponsorship, which had been key to the field's first large-scale institutionalization—*Volkskunde* began to translate the publicly pervasive discourse of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* into its institutional memory via narrative identity performances, which in turn translated into changes in the field's knowledge and organizational structures. By addressing an unredeemably sordid past with a spectrum of discursive strategies ranging from reframing the canon in order to exonerate it, to nearly discarding it in a bid to rid the field of all ideological taint, to exorcising the site of its delegitimation, German *Volkskundler* have affected (or resisted) epistemic ruptures transforming the contours of the field.

In the early postwar years, the field's internal historiographic narratives aimed to defend against outside criticism and maintain the *status quo* in order to preserve what might have been abolished because of complicity in a murderous regime. This aim was pursued by positing the Nazi period as an anomaly that, though affirmed by some

Volkskundler, did not reflect the whole scientific community or a fundamental flaw in the discipline. The dawn of the Cold War then split the narratives between East and West in a way that ossified a discussion into an almost permanent division. In the West, scholars' initial resistance to disciplinary self-criticism began to loosen with the Munich School's consideration of the present state and future of the field in light of its undeniable—but still unspeakable—Nazi entanglements (Chapter 1). Practically speaking, however, the field did not stray far from the norms it had established prior to the war in working out its place as a "*Zwischenfach*"[601]—an "in-between field"—situated between *Germanistik*, *Völkerkunde* (now *Ethnologie*), and *Kulturgeschichte*.

The scene changed rapidly in the late 1960s, as the very term *Volkskunde* became a lightning rod for a disciplinary revolution in West Germany. By teasing out the field's ideological entanglements with National Socialism, the "68ers" proposed a true disciplinary reorientation, not just a rescue mission. The structural outcome of this translation of the Nazi past from individualized anomaly to generalized self-critique was, however, an internal splintering reflecting diverse external orientations toward other national models of cultural anthropology and toward other fields of cultural and social research in the German-speaking world. When West German *Volkskunde* translated a public discourse upending the postwar national identity narrative into the fault lines of an intradisciplinary fracturing, a new origin myth was established that identified the field not as lamentably susceptible to politicization, but as laudably self-reflexive and socially responsible (Chapter 2).

Meanwhile, in East Germany, state direction—an extension of East Bloc ideology—was the dominating force in both public discourse concerning intellectual life

[601] Wiegelmann, Zender, and Heilfurth, *Volkskunde*, 38.

and institutional memory within disciplines (Chapter 4). That is, whereas the institutional memory of West German *Volkskunde* held an ambiguous position toward the state—positing it as a potentially corrupting outside force, but also as a site for the field to perform its specialist social *Aufgabe*, for instance by intervening in political discourses concerning cultural diversity—East German *Volkskunde*'s identity narratives were largely performed precisely for the Communist government and affected by its direct arranging of the discipline's organizational and epistemic structures. As a result, until the end of the Cold War, the institutional memory of GDR *Volkskunde* could not function as a symbiosis of narrative and structure translations in response to shifts in public discourse, but rather mainly as a conveyance of official state ideology. Though there were moments of resistance—for instance, in responses to the pressure to combine *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* under the Soviet model of *Ethnographie*—it was not until after the *Wende* that the *Volkskundler* of East Germany could begin to reform what was a largely uniform, politicized institutional memory into more ambiguous, often individualized narratives.

After the country's reunification in 1989/90, as German society, and *Volkskunde* with it, dealt with the reality of absorbing the GDR under West German political, economic, social, and scientific structures, a new, common institutional memory was needed to bridge the transition (Chapter 5). There were early attempts and ongoing efforts to do so—for instance, through the network between Tübingen and certain East German *Volkskundler* or the historiographic work at the Humboldt University's Institut für Europäische Ethnologie. However, the field's institutional memory—much like German national historiography itself—remains splintered. After the *Wende*, with the first and second generations of East German *Volkskundler* now either retired or integrated in a new, different organizational and epistemic structure, it falls to a third generation of *Volkskundler* / *Europäische Ethnologen*—who have no adult memory of the East—to

articulate a disciplinary identity narrative after the East German field's organizational and institutional structures were erased. That is, like the GDR itself, East German *Volkskunde* now lies somewhere between institutional memory and postmemory (Chapter 5).

Finally, beginning in the 1990s, Germany's *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie*—still effectively an extension of the West German tradition—entered a state of relative normalcy. By translating West German *Volkskunde*'s ideological splintering in the 1960s/70s into a positively valued "unity in diversity" and associating that wave of disciplinary *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* with the international reflexive turn in cultural anthropology, a traumatic rupture was reinscribed in institutional memory as a productive characteristic of (West) Germany's particular tradition (Chapter 3). Yet, even with this translation of a new European identity narrative into institutional identity discourses, the field's structural "diversity" is still the product of—and so preserves the institutional memory of—struggles to throw off the burden of the past under National Socialism.

At this point, an interpretive issue emerges. The translations of national politics into disciplinary narratives—in this case entailing the routine reinscription of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in institutional memory—explicated in Part I and touched upon in Part II might tempt the historiographer of German *Volkskunde* to contain the disciplinary identity narrative within the bounds of national developments. Yet, as Part III will elucidate, postwar Germany's *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* presents an especially apt case study of the significance of international knowledge flows.[602] Thus, on

[602] Comparative or transnational studies in history of science studies are increasingly being pursued. Often framed in terms of the migration of scientists, work on transnational knowledge flows might also consider phenomena of reception, translation, publication, and international collaboration. Consider, for instance, the transnational perspectives offered in Brett M. Bennett and Joseph Morgan Hodge, eds., *Science and Empire Knowledge and Networks of Science across the British Empire, 1800–1970* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Christian Fleck, *A Transatlantic History of the Social Sciences Robber Barons, the Third Reich and the Invention of Empirical Social Research*, trans. Hella Beister (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2011); Mitchell G. Ash and Alfons Söllner, eds., *Forced Migration and Scientific Change: Emigre German-Speaking Scientists and Scholars after 1933* (Washington, D.C.: German Historical

the one hand, the chapters home in on the boundary between Germany's *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* and other national traditions of, and international movements in, cultural anthropology and folklore studies.

The second set of boundaries to be excavated here are also commonplaces of the historiography of science. They are closer to what Kuhn and Bourdieu refer to when speaking about competition: in this case, it is a matter of the boundaries that distinguish *Volkskunde* from its neighboring fields in the humanities and social sciences within Germany. The theoretical point must be reiterated, however, that the significance of international boundary traversal in this field's institutional memory is often intimately intertwined with knowledge flows between disciplines, national and international. The influence of Swedish *folklivsforskning* (folklife studies) in the rise of *Europäische Ethnologie* as the dominant disciplinary identity, for instance, or the impact of American anthropology at the University of Frankfurt's Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie and its genealogical offshoots, are cases in point that will be explicated here.

By recovering these additional boundary issues in *Volkskunde*'s institutional memory and explicating how they are enmeshed with one another, as well as with the fraught boundary between state and science, Part III ultimately offers both material for amplifying theoretical framings in the historiography of science and an alternative periodization of postwar *Volkskunde*. This periodization does not hew so closely to the

---

Institute and Cambridge University Press, 1996); Mitchell G. Ash and Jan Surman, eds., *The Nationalization of Scientific Knowledge in the Habsburg Empire, 1848–1918* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); David Kettler and Gerhard Lauer, eds., *Exile, Science, and Bildung: The Contested Legacies of German Emigre Intellectuals* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005); Felix Rösch, *Émigré Scholars and the Genesis of International Relations: A European Discipline in America?* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

discourse of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, nor does it follow the *Sonderweg* argumentation. Rather, it is concerned with the long-term evolution of the discipline.

The necessity of constructing this alternative chronology based on a broader consideration of the boundary trope is predicated on the field's arrival at a state of relative normalcy, understood in both the Kuhnian and the sociopolitical sense. This claim is not to suggest that, with a new set of conditions, one could or ought to retranslate institutional memory strictly in terms of interdisciplinary and international boundary issues, without any acknowledgement of the impact of the National Socialist period. Instead, the purpose of these chapters is to raise to visibility the salience of boundaries with other specialist fields within the context of dealing with the more pressing problem of the state-science boundary. To recognize that interdisciplinary and international boundary issues were assumed into the *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* trope—that is, treated as subordinate or precipitated by the primary postwar boundary issue, that of science and the state—is not to criticize the myopia of institutional memory or to downplay the role of national boundaries in science, but rather simply to emphasize that, in the case of Germany's *Volkskunde*, engaging those boundaries was a necessary means of dealing with the Nazi past. The field is now at a point, however, where it is possible to translate the narratives of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* into new disciplinary self-narratives and structures reflecting circumstances of a more international nature.

Such an alternative chronology of how interdisciplinary and international boundaries informed the field's identity narratives and structures is also *necessary* for understanding continuing translations of institutional memory into new contexts, crossing borders in response to emerging external pressures. For instance, changes in structures of government research funding entails redrawing the boundaries between disciplines competing with one another for support. But university structure also alters the borders

between disciplines, in cases such as today's supragovernmental initiatives to integrate and standardize higher education in Europe.

Other Europeanizing or globalizing forces create other kinds of borders when demographics, and with that, national and regional cultures, shift. As German culture becomes multicultural, and Germans become European and global citizens through world travel abroad and leadership in the European Union at home, for instance, these emerging pressures are prompting changes in *Volkskunde*'s epistemic structures, and with that, its narrative identity performances. Specialists in the field today are studying, for instance, globe-trotting young backpackers, the construction of urban public spaces in comparative perspective, and new models for understanding cultural flows and intercultural relations in Germany.[603]

As we have seen in prior chapters, the translation of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* in West German *Volkskunde*'s institutional memory flowed from one structural reorientation to another through the agency of narrative. Meanwhile, the Communist state provided both narratives and structures for the East German tradition. In reunified Germany at the dawn of the twenty-first century, one can more clearly see how structural responses to cultural change—whether enforced or organic—are beginning to affect the field's self-narratives. Having seen in Parts I and II how *Volkskunde*'s structures developed from 1945 to the present, then, Chapters 6 and 7 expand the analytical purview to register multiple, interacting disciplinary boundaries to reveal how and why

[603] See, for instance, Jana Binder, "Globality: Eine Ethnographie über Backpacker" (PhD diss., Goethe Universität Frankfurt am Main, 2005); Darieva, Kaschuba, and Krebs, *Urban Spaces after Socialism*; Eliza Bertuzzo et al., eds., *Kontrolle öffentlicher Räume: Unterstützen, Unterdrücken, Unterhalten, Unterwandern*, zeithorizonte—Perspektiven Europäischer Ethnologie 12 (Berlin: LIT, 2013); Regina Römhild, "Confronting the Logic of the Nation-State: Transnational Migration and Cultural Globalisation in Germany," *Ethnologia Europaea* 33, no. 1 (2003): 61–72.

interdisciplinary and international boundary narratives were and were not effective in affecting those changes.

Chapter 6:

On the Ambivalence of Boundary-Crossing in Institutional Memory

This chapter considers the various uses for which ideas about *Volkskunde*'s disciplinary boundaries were mobilized in discursive identity performances between the early postwar years and the late 1980s. The analysis centers on three key performances of *Volkskunde*'s disciplinary boundaries—national and international—that have come to occupy an ambivalent place in institutional memory: a 1955 meeting of European folklorists and regional ethnologists in Arnhem, the Netherlands to discuss possibilities for a common disciplinary identity in Europe; the 1970 meeting of West German *Volkskundler* at Falkenstein (discussed in Chapter 2), and a 1982 workshop in West Berlin aimed at defining *Europäische Ethnologie* as a space for *Volkskundler* and *Ethnologen* / *Völkerkundler* to share the study of contemporary Europe.

In terms of the symbiosis of institutional memory, it will be shown how these meetings' respective presentations of the field's past identity were ultimately ineffectual for bridging disciplinary boundaries. That the Arnhem and West Berlin meetings largely remained in the background of institutional memory is further evidence of their failure to affect any structural change in their time. But, as the subsequent chapter will conclude, as the trope of boundary-crossing is today taking a more prominent place in disciplinary

self-narratives, these events may still be translated into part of the positive narrative of German *Volkskunde*'s *Sonderweg*—its special path to normalization in the national and international scientific and public spheres.

NEIGHBORING FIELDS AS THREAT, AS RESOURCE

We recall that Germany's *Volkskunde* in the immediate postwar period was at pains to demarcate the boundaries that set it apart from other scholarly disciplines, both in and outside the GDR and FRG. Yet both scholarly communities registered those boundaries with ambivalence, posited their field's position toward others in strategically expedient ways to defend their own continuing, separate existence. The first articulation of the field's dire situation after the war came from an outsider, the leftist sociologist Heinz Maus. Maus claimed to identify *Volkskunde*'s fundamental flaw—the missed opportunity of realizing Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl's mid-nineteenth century vision for an independent, socially critical, and modern national cultural science. But he also claimed to know how the field might rescue what semblance of legitimate research it can offer, namely by aligning itself methodologically and theoretically with the more established neighboring fields of *Ethnologie* (or *Völkerkunde*) and *Kulturgeschichte*, and with the newer, more progressive field of sociology.

From *Ethnologie*, Maus implied, *Volkskundler* could stand to learn more precise research methods that would help the field finally escape its persistent dilettante status and, with that, throw off its nationalist undercurrent.[604] By understanding itself within the larger framework of *Kulturgeschichte*, *Volkskunde* could become a specialist field for doing contemporary social history. Without that reorientation, Maus cautions, the field

[604] Maus, "Zur Situation der deutschen Volkskunde," 356.

could easily be absorbed by its neighboring fields like the history of literature, music, and religion. Moreover, he cautions that focusing on folklore (and with that, the notion of *Volk*), as the Nordic tradition was doing, is not enough to restabilize the discipline. Instead, Maus insists, the focus must be explicitly on modern society using modern sociological concepts if the field is to have any chance of survival.[605] That is, *Volkskunde* would have to lay claims to being both historical and contemporary, offering a diachronic dimension of cultural analysis as well as the synchronic-demographic one that sociology offers. By working in close cooperation with those three fields, Maus concludes, *Volkskunde* could contribute to the study of modern society by examining the life of the people "von unten her" (from the ground up),[606] still in historical context, without the former nationalist historicizing (i.e., restorative) mission, but rather for the betterment of all mankind.[607] In Maus's evaluation, then, *Volkskunde*'s best hope for survival is through interdisciplinary collaboration. This was, however, hardly the perspective of the leading *Volkskundler* who returned to work after the war.

Will-Erich Peuckert, we recall, dismantled Maus's argument piece by piece, insisting that Maus simply knew nothing about the field beyond popular perceptions of its Nazification.[608] Not only were very few *Volkskundler* directly involved in the Nazi racial project, he insisted; the most recent theories of culture developed by figures like Adolf Spamer and Peuckert himself were perfectly legitimate and useable, and quite progressive.[609] Peuckert finds equally uninformed Maus's recommendation that the field ought to redefine itself in alignment with its neighbors in order to save itself: *Volkskunde*

---

[605] Ibid., 357–358.
[606] Ibid., 357.
[607] Ibid., 356–359.
[608] Peuckert, "Zur Situation der Volkskunde."
[609] Ibid., 42–48.

was in fact already turning to questions of modern culture, as the field was in conversation with sociology and *Ethnologie* during the war years. However, the Amt Rosenberg suppressed such studies because they threatened the Nazi mission for *Volkskunde* to study—and so to construct—a national folk culture.[610] In sum, in Peuckert's assessment, the Nazis were the problem, not *Volkskunde*; the field can and will make its own way as an independent discipline, Peuckert effectively declares, for its true essence and orientation were never corrupted.

In a later publication, however, Peuckert readily explicates *Volkskunde*'s work and worth in terms of its relationship to neighboring fields, thus belying his own disclaimers. In *Volkskunde: Quellen und Forschungen seit 1930* (1951), he and his coauthor Otto Lauffer declare *Volkskunde* to be a historical science[611] operating in part sociologically since its first articulation by Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl.[612] More specific interdisciplinary resonances are offered concerning *Ethnologie* / *Völkerkunde*, namely surrounding concepts of *Völkerpsychologie* and social structure.[613] However, Peuckert and Lauffer also maintain that the relationship between *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* is one of provoking new ideas about culture and society that *Volkskundler* have translated, so to speak, into their own concepts.[614] In other words, while there may be resonances in theorizing, there is nonetheless a clear distinction between the fields and how they deploy those concepts. Meanwhile, Peuckert and Lauffer make no mention of the reception of *Volkskunde* in the work of *Völkerkunde*, giving the (no doubt unintentional) appearance

---

610 Ibid., 131.
611 Peuckert and Lauffer, *Volkskunde: Quellen und Forschungen seit 1930*, 25.
612 Ibid., 11.
613 Ibid., 16–18. Among the German-speaking anthropologists whose influence can be felt in *Volkskunde* theorizing they name Adolf Bastian and Friedrich Ratzel (German), and Wilhelm Schmidt (Austrian). Further international influences they identify are Edward B. Tylor, James Frazer, and Bronislaw Malinowski (British), Ralph Linton (American), and Lucien Levy-Brühl (French).
614 Ibid., 18.

that *Volkskunde* owes more to *Völkerkunde* than vice versa. The same image of subservience appears with relation to the field of history as Peuckert and Lauffer reiterate a contemporaneous French description of *Volkskunde* as a "historisch[e] Hilfswissenschaft" (historical auxiliary discipline). Still, the directionality of influence is not as important as defining a clear division between the fields.[615]

Perhaps more useful to the mission of scaffolding *Volkskunde*'s legitimacy were the often permeated, yet soundly intact boundaries with traditions of *Volkskunde* and folklore studies in German-speaking Europe and the Nordic countries. For instance, Peuckert and Lauffer, as well as Gerhard Lutz, posit the 1946 publication of Swiss *Volkskundler* Richard Weiss's *Volkskunde in der Schweiz* as evidence of the next wave of legitimate work in *their* field.[616] Next to Weiss, Lutz sees Austrian *Volkskundler* Viktor von Geramb as the most important representative of German(-speaking) *Volkskunde* in the immediate war years, with Leopold Schmidt (also Austrian) likewise receiving a mention.[617] While, unquestionably, networks of scholars historically crisscrossed the German-speaking traditions, Peuckert, Lauffer, and Lutz center their treatments on the work of German *Volkskundler*, implying that, though related, the Austrian and Swiss traditions are separate and on the periphery of their own.

Invocations of the Scandinavian tradition, meanwhile, indicated specifically toward the circle around Swedish folklorist Sigurd Erixon (1888–1968)[618] and the field of

---

615 Ibid., 25.

616 Weiss, *Volkskunde der Schweiz: Grundriss*. Cited in Lutz, *Volkskunde: Ein Handbuch*, 231; Peuckert and Lauffer, *Volkskunde: Quellen und Forschungen seit 1930*, 13–14.

617 Cited in Lutz, *Volkskunde: Ein Handbuch*, 108–125; 158–179; 202–228; 231. Three decades later, in a similarly intentioned collection of the most important essays of contemporary *Volkskunde*, Helge Gerndt would add Austrian Leopold Schmidt to the core cast of leading early postwar *Volkskundler* (Lutz covers 1930 to present; Gerndt covers 1945 to present).

618 On the life and work of Sigurd Erixon, see the special double volume of the journal *Ethnologia Europaea* (1968–1969, 2/3), his *Festschrift*: *Erixoniana*. Se also Tomas Gerholm, "Sweden: Central Ethnology, Peripheral Anthropology," in *Fieldwork and Footnotes: Studies in the History of European Anthropology*, ed. Han F. Vermeulen, Arturo Alvarez Roldán, and European Association of Social

folklifsforskning, or Nordic and comparative folklife research.[619] Peuckert and Lauffer dedicate several pages to laying out the importance of this field for the development of folklore studies internationally.[620] Indeed, they elevate Erixon to the level of the renowned German *Volkskundler*, Adolf Spamer, by opening the book with their shared definition of *Volkskunde*'s disciplinary identity.[621]

Like the German-speaking tradition of separating *Volkskunde* from *Völkerkunde*, Swedish cultural anthropology traditionally distinguished between folklore (*folklifsforskning*) and anthropology (*allmän och jämförande etnografi*). But in Peuckert and Lauffer's treatment, there is significant resonance between *folklifsforskning* and the fields of psychology, sociology, and *Ethnologie*, especially in terms of the regional and contemporary scope of research. In terms of the implications for German *Volkskunde*, on the one hand, identifying this resonance threatens to undermine a notion of *Volkskunde* as an independent field. On the other hand, there is a distinct advantage to aligning with a folklore school as strong as Erixon's, namely, because it successfully situates not only sociology, but also anthropology and psychology, as just a "*Hilfswissenschaft*" to folklore studies, and not the other way around.[622]

Anthropologists (London: Routledge, 1995), 159–70; Svensson, *Einführung in die europäische Ethnologie*, W. Edson Richmond, "Sigurd Erixon (1888–1968)," *The Journal of American Folklore* 81, no. 322 (1968): 348.

619 On Erixon's model of comparative folklife studies as European ethnology, see, for instance, Sigurd Emanuel Erixon, *Ethnologie régionale ou folklore* (Stockholm: Meddelanden fran Institutet for folklivsforskning, 1951); Erixon, "Regional European Ethnology"; Sigurd Erixon, "Folklivsforskningen som universitetsämne," *Folk-Liv*, 1944, 286–313; Sigurd Erixon, "Folk-Life Research in Our Time: From a Swedish Point of View," *Gwerin* 6, no. 3 (1962): 275–91; Sigurd Emanuel Erixon, "European Ethnology in Our Time," *Ethnologia Europaea* 1, no. 1 (1967): 3–11. See, in general, contributions to the journals he founded: *Folk-liv. Acta ethnologica et folkloristica Europea* (founded 1937), *LAOS* (1951–1955), and *Ethnologia Europaea* (founded 1966).

620 Peuckert and Lauffer, *Volkskunde: Quellen und Forschungen seit 1930*, 8, 14–16.

621 Ibid., 8.

622 Ibid., 15.

But Erixon's international influence also would complicate the defense narrative of Germany's *Volkskunde*, for he was the main advocate of expanding the notion of folklore research to become a regional European ethnology, translated into German as *Europäische Ethnologie*. Even in Hans Moser's 1954 attempt at a less defensive, more productive proposal for a new way forward for *Volkskunde*, the notion of a European ethnology becomes situated as part of an overt threat narrative. German *Volkskunde*'s most pressing mission, he argues, is to reestablish the criteria of its existence as a "Grundwissenschaft."[623] To find "where its fundamental purpose, its center, and its strengths lie"[624] is, in that sense, a matter of clarifying and reinforcing the field's boundaries. Indeed, he describes the problem of permeable interdisciplinary boundaries under the heading "Von Gefährdungen der Volkskunde."[625] The reality that *Volkskunde* shares a number of overlapping research objects with sociology, *Kulturgeschichte*, ancient history, and *Völkerkunde* poses a true threat, and Moser fears Erixon's expansion of folklore studies to a regional, European field would only exacerbate the problem.[626]

Yet even in Moser's definition, *Volkskunde*'s fundamental identity is understood in terms of the field's relationship to a disciplinary neighbor. For, like Peuckert, he sees the field as fundamentally a historical science—not in the sense that the field produces historical knowledge, but that it situates knowledge about contemporary culture in its historical context. Thus, it would seem that at that point in time, *Volkskunde* was only able to define itself with reference to its disciplinary neighbors, in Germany and abroad.

In these examples, one sees how drawing out resonances and continuities—in theory and theorists—with other cultural sciences and national traditions of folklore

---

623 Moser, "Gedanken zur heutigen Volkskunde," 210.
624 "wo ihre wesensgemäße Bestimmung, ihre Mitte und ihre Stärke liegt." Ibid., 232.
625 "On the Endangering of *Volkskunde.*" Ibid., 213.
626 Ibid., 217.

studies was a means for West German *Volkskundler* in the late 1940s and 50s to defend the legitimacy of their field by, first, neutralizing the implications of Nazi involvement, and then by carving out a specific role for *Volkskunde* among its many specialist neighbors in the German-speaking sphere. However, the alliance with non-German-speaking European folklore studies would begin to erode as Erixon's model of a regional, Europeanist ethnology gradually displaced traditions of national folklore studies in Western Europe, both as a research orientation and as a common disciplinary title.

The beginning of the West German defense narrative's breakdown can be observed in records of a September 1955 meeting of European folklorists and ethnologists at Arnhem, the Netherlands. This International Conference for Folklore Studies was the third organized by the UNESCO-sponsored Commission Internationale des Arts Populaires (CIEP, founded 1928)—the predecessor organization of the Societé Internationale d'Ethnologie et de Folklore (SIEF, founded 1964).[627] The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the common goals, theories, and methods of the various national disciplines of European ethnology, as well as the value of the field to international bodies like UNESCO for uniting peoples through the dissemination of cultural knowledge.[628] Within the discussion, presenters examined the place of folklore studies in the humanities and social sciences, as well as its specific relation to art history, language, literature, and music.

West German *Volkskundler* Bruno Schier provided a short report on the conference for the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*. But beyond the basic description above, it did little to convey the West German reaction to this Europeanizing initiative. For, rather

---

[627] On the history of CIEP and SIEF, see International Society for Ethnology and Folklore, "History of SIEF," *SIEF—International Society for Ethnology and Folklore*, October 6, 2008, http://www.siefhome.org/about/history.shtml.

[628] Schier, "Internationaler Kongress für Volkskunde in Arnheim (20.–24. September 1955)," 297.

than reintegrate West German *Volkskunde* into the international scientific community, the meeting became a performance site of *Volkskunde*'s self-perceived exceptional status.

A fuller picture of the conference's tone and implications, and the German response thereto, is offered by Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann in the East German journal *Deutsches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde*. She identifies the conference's goal as one of exploring the diversity of names for the discipline found across the continent (and in the U.S., as well) and to settle on an umbrella term for all to use to refer to it.[629] Papers on the field's relation to its neighboring disciplines were presented, as Schier also reports, but the most rigorous discussion surrounded the theme of *Volkskunde* as a social science, led by Karl Meisen (Bonn) and Sigurd Erixon (Stockholm).[630] Meisen argued for a sociological orientation on the basis of Adolf Spamer's (German) and Richard Weiss's (Swiss) respective work on social groups and strata (*Schichten*).[631] Meanwhile, folklorists from beyond the German-speaking realm argued for the unity of *Volkskunde*, folklore, and *Ethnologie*, and proposed the name *Ethnologie* as the international term to refer to them all. Here, Weber-Kellermann is quick to mention that the Eastern European countries and the GDR had already adopted such a unified model[632] (though she herself opposed it[633]).

---

[629] Weber-Kellermann, "Internationaler Volkskundekongress vom 20. bis 24. September 1955 in Arnhem / Holland," 264.

[630] Gerhard Lutz noted later that Meisen and Erixon landed on the same idea of a European ethnology around the same time, but that the two differed in vision when it came to the proximation to *Ethnologie*. Gerhard Lutz, "Deutsche Volkskunde und europäische Ethnologie: Zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der 50er Jahre," *Ethnologia Europaea* 4 (1970): 28.

[631] It is notable that Weber-Kellermann's description of Meisen and Erixon's discussion of the *Schichten* concept makes no mention of Hans Naumann's use of the term, but references only reputable German-speaking theorists.

[632] Weber-Kellermann, "Internationaler Volkskundekongress vom 20. bis 24. September 1955 in Arnhem / Holland," 265.

[633] See Weber-Kellermann, "Zum Problem."

The West German, Swiss, and Austrian representatives, for their part, were unanimously opposed to having *Volkskunde* organized under the umbrella term *Ethnologie*, as that was already chosen as the new name for *Völkerkunde* in the German-speaking sphere. As Weber-Kellermann explains, "Bei voller Erkenntnis der nahen Blutsverwandtschaft von Volks- und Völkerkunde sei bei dem Stand der wissenschaftsgeschichtlichen Entwicklung in den genannten deutschsprachigen Ländern eine völlige Verschmelzung ohne empfindlichen Prestigeverlust für die Volkskunde nicht möglich." It was clear, then, that the Western German-speaking *Volkskundler* feared that, if their field were described under the international heading *Ethnologie*, it might soon be subsumed epistemically and institutionally by *Völkerkunde*, which had already adopted the name for itself.[634]

Thus, although Schier described the meeting as "a sparkling jewel in the history of our discipline,"[635] and SIEF's official memory posits the Arnhem conferences as "a peak in the scholarly life of CIAP,"[636] these recollections seem to refer to the willingness of participants to discuss the issues, not to a final consensus. Though Erixon's vision for the field dominated, by the conclusion of the conference, the question of a unified identity for all of Europe's folklore studies and nativist anthropology traditions remained unanswered. While not every party was immediately prepared to combine national or regional folklore studies (*Volkskunde*) under the international disciplinary umbrella of

634 "To give full recognition to the close blood relationship between *Volks*- and *Völkerkunde* would mean, given the state of historical disciplinary development in the named German-speaking countries, that a complete merger would not be possible without a sensitive loss of prestige for *Volkskunde*." Weber-Kellermann, "Internationaler Volkskundekongress vom 20. bis 24. September 1955 in Arnhem / Holland," 265.

635 The hyperbole of Schier's description makes one wonder, in retrospect, if he was speaking a little tongue in cheek : ". . . in dem Perlenkranze der internationalen Veranstaltungen, die wir seit Kriegausgang erleben durften, wird der Volkskundliche Kongress von Arnheim als ein besonders glanzvolles Juwel in die Geschichte unserer Wissenschaft eingehen." Schier, "Internationaler Kongress für Volkskunde in Arnheim (20.–24. September 1955)," 297.

636 International Society for Ethnology and Folklore, "History of SIEF."

ethnology (*Ethnologie*),[637] only the Western German-speaking faction completely rejected the proposal out of hand and exited the conversation.

In the 1950s and into the 1960s, the West German *Volkskundler* were in agreement about maintaining the integrity of their tradition over and against *Völkerkunde* / *Ethnologie*, which in turn meant carving a unique postwar disciplinary identity in contrast to other European ethnologies. However, this is not to suggest that they had settled the internal issues surrounding their field's disciplinary identity. To the contrary, by the 1960s—when other European traditions were finally settling on a common identity, whereby folklore would be separated from European ethnology, which in turn for many countries became a regional specialty of ethnology—*Volkskunde* was facing the identity question most forcefully, leading to an internal orientational splintering. The next section will explore how international and interdisciplinary boundary relations served as crucial reference points for the emergence of those internal fault lines that would ultimately be translated into a new paradigm of unity in diversity.

NEIGHBORING FIELDS AS RESOURCE FOR SELF-REFORM, AS SOURCE OF DIVISION

In his seminal contribution to the institutional memory of *Volkskunde*'s 1960s self-critique, Gottfried Korff situates the meeting at Arnhem within the broader political-

[637] Hermann Bausinger recently observed that, even when CIAP was reorganized as SIEF in 1964 to continue the mission of gathering together the individual traditions—as well as to foster relations between Western and Eastern traditions—the influence on the field's development in Germany was not very great. Bausinger, *Ein Aufklärer des Alltags*, 134. Yet, according to the official history of the organization, the struggle within CIAP/SIEF would continue through the 1960s, with debates falling along several fault lines: "between those who wanted one unified discipline (European ethnology) and those who wanted to keep folklore as a separate discipline, between those who considered general ethnology / anthropology to be the mother discipline and those who saw the disciplines as clearly separate, and between those who wanted the organization to cover the whole world and those who saw Europe only as the field." In the end, from the organization's perspective, the separation between folklore and ethnology / anthropology won out. International Society for Ethnology and Folklore, "History of SIEF."

economic context of the Federal Republic's integration into the West—thought to be the best solution for preventing a reemergence of fascism in the West and for thwarting communism in the East. In the same way, he recalls, West European disciplinary colleagues had hoped that the international discussions at Arnhem would finally mean the end of the German "*Sonderweg*" for West German *Volkskunde*. This was not to be the case, however. As Gerhard Lutz described the scene from his view in 1970, the West German rejection of the 1950s proposals for a *Europäische Ethnologie* was a historically explicable, yet ultimately wrong-headed defensive reaction to the encroachment of *Ethnologie.* Almost twenty years later, Helge Gerndt inscribes Arnhem in institutional memory as a site of intense international debate over the significance of a European ethnology that had no effects on the German-speaking countries.[638] Most recently, Reinhard Johler recalls the conversations around Arnhem as not an end to, but a veritable benchmark in German *Volkskunde*'s postwar *Sonderweg*.[639]

The point at which *Volkskunde* truly began to turn to international and interdisciplinary cooperations would instead be remembered as arriving a decade and a

---

[638] Gerndt, *Fach und Begriff "Volkskunde,"* 16. Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann and her posthumous coeditors situate Arnhem in the same way: that it took a long time before West German *Volkskundler* took the notion of *Europäische Ethnologie* seriously. Weber-Kellermann, Bimmer, and Becker, *Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie*, 137.

[639] Johler credits Gerhard Lutz with being among the first *Volkskundler* to speak of the field's *Sonderweg*, which Lutz identified as closely tied with the field's "complex, contradictory relationship . . . to cultural anthropology, or rather to European Anthropology"—that is, *Völkerkunde* / *Ethnologie*. Specifically, Johler recalls Lutz's 1970 interpretation of the West German reaction to Arnhem and the international discussions about a European ethnology that surrounded it, in effect locating the meeting as a crossroads in the field's *Sonderweg* at which the *Volkskundler* chose to continue the traditional national pathway. Johler, "Doing European Ethnology in a Time of Change: The Metamorphosis of a Discipline (in Germany and Europe)," 248; Lutz, "Deutsche Volkskunde und europäische Ethnologie: Zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der 50er Jahre."

Further sources on the legacy of Arnhem include Gerhard Lutz, "Die Entstehung der Ethnologie und das spätere Nebeneinander der Fächer Volkskunde und Völkerkunde in Deutschland," in *Europäische Ethnologie*, ed. Heide Nixdorff and Thomas Hauschild (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1982), 29–46; Thomas K. Schippers, "A History of Paradoxes: Anthropologies of Europe," in *Fieldwork and Footnotes: Studies in the History of European Anthropology*, ed. Han F. Vermeulen and Arturo Alvarez Roldán (London: Routledge, 1995), 234–46.

half after Arnhem, in the disciplinary reform movement that played out at the Detmold and Falkenstein conferences. There, as we recall from Chapter 2, the factions that drove *Volkskunde*'s fracturing can be traced well along the lines of the field names they advocated: the largely older, more conservative cohort wishing to continue with *Volkskunde*, the Tübingen School carving its own way with *Empirische Kulturwissenschaft*, Ina-Maria Greverus and Gerhard Lutz speaking for *Kulturanthropologie*, and then *Europäische Ethnologie*, which eventually became the dominant institutional title and umbrella term for the field. Here, let us consider in more detail how the top proposed alternatives to *Volkskunde* as the field's postwar identity represented several distinct interdisciplinary and international boundary-crossings.

We begin with the Tübingen School, where Hermann Bausinger led the charge toward a fundamental disciplinary shift. Bidding goodbye to folklife,[640] but retaining a historicizing perspective for research on modern cultural phenomena, especially in a regional framework, those in Tübingen saw sociology as a pathway to rigorous—and in that way, redeeming—empiricism. Gottfried Korff, for his part, describes sociology as an international discipline,[641] most likely referring to the international impact of the Frankfurt School whose work is cited throughout the Tübingen manifestos, but also to international neo-Marxian theory more generally, which informed the social sciences in that time. Later emphases on the Tübingen School's connections—orientational and actual—to the Birmingham School also suggest internationalism along those lines.[642]

The Tübingen School became internationally oriented in the 1960s/70s not only in seeking a new way forward, but also in its associates' international announcement of the

[640] Korff, Jeggle, and Geiger, *Abschied vom Volksleben*.
[641] Korff, "Namenwechsel als Paradigmenwechsel?," 417.
[642] Bausinger, *Ein Aufklärer des Alltags*, 136–137.

institute's activities via publications in international journals, translations, and international scholar exchanges.[643] In his 2006 autobiography, Bausinger posits himself and the institute as frequently operating through boundary-crossing, both disciplinary and geopolitical.[644] Despite his claim that *Volkskundler*'s interest in establishing international connections was for the most part not very great in the 1960s/70s, other institutes besides Tübingen were engaging in public relations at that time to reintroduce the German tradition to the international scientific community.[645]

At the Falkenstein meeting, the Tübingen *Volkskundler* were rather on the defensive. The institute's new direction was already well established by the time of the meeting, which was organized partly in response to their critical writings across the previous decade. Thus, the Tübingen circle were perceived as provocateurs challenging other *Volkskunde* institutes to question their own historical investments and to contemplate a new direction out of untenable romanticism and ideological commitments.[646] For Frankfurt *Volkskundler* Ina-Maria Greverus, however, such provocation was hardly needed. From her perspective, the best way forward for the field was to connect with American cultural anthropology, which she translates as *Kulturanthropologie* and uses extensively in her contributions to the conference.

---

643 See, for instance, Bausinger, "Folklore Research at the University of Tübingen." On the translation phenomenon, see Bausinger, *Ein Aufklärer des Alltags*, 136. For specific examples of scholarly exchanges, see Ibid., 137–140.

644 Bausinger, *Ein Aufklärer des Alltags*, 133–150.

645 See, for instance, the August 1968 special issue of the *Journal of the Folkllore Institute* (5, no. 2/3) with English-language essays by German *Volkskundler* outlining the activities of the *Volkskunde* institutes at Göttingen, Marburg, Hamburg, Tübingen, Freiburg im Briesgau, and the GDR, as well as topical essays on the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, the *Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde*, folk narrative research, folk medicine, popular piety, and legal history.

The reluctance to establish connections, for Tübingen at least, had also to do with the time and financial cost, especially when it came to trans-Atlantic networking. For that reason, Bausinger recalls, Tübingen *Volkskundler* were more likely to work with colleagues in nearby France or central Europe or even with East German colleagues. Ibid., 141–143.

646 Brückner, *Falkensteiner Protokolle*, 69.

The American tradition was built upon Franz Boas's (a German geographer and Jewish exile) anthropological model of the human condition comprising biological, social, economic, and cultural elements, expressed in interaction with the natural world. Thus, that model in and of itself implies interdisciplinary cooperation, notes Greverus and her conference working group. To be concerned mainly with the social elements of everyday life is the purview of sociology—her critique of the Tübingen path. An orientation toward cultural anthropology, in contrast, offers the analytical advantage of maintaining a conversation with *Ethnologie*, philosophical anthropology, and social psychology, while permitting the retention of a distinct disciplinary identity through a focus on everyday life and regional cultural identity.[647]

Arguments against a shift to *Kulturanthropologie* were raised on conceptual, but even more so on terminological grounds reflecting the international politics of science. Some discussants questioned whether Germany needed follow the American tradition simply because it was further developed and comprised of a larger community. In a time when many American but also British anthropologists come to Europe to do the research that "we" should be doing, why acquiesce to their terminology? Why not call ourselves something unique like *Kultursoziologie* or *Sozialanthropologie* that describes the research we are doing but does not simply acquiesce to a term that is, on the one hand, hegemonic, and on the other hand, rather empty precisely because of its ubiquity? Still other participants turned the viewpoint on its head by arguing that even if the term *Volkskunde* were retained, in the international sphere it inevitably would need to be described with a different term—*Ethnologie* or *Sozial-* or *Kulturanthropologie*—to be

[647] Ibid., 95–107; 163–180.

recognized as a fellow conversant. To choose a neologism, like *Kultursoziologie* or *Sozialanthropologie*, would simply continue the German field's isolation.[648]

There was also the very real problem of the root word *Anthropologie*, which in the history of the German sciences was associated with the genetic, biological, or racial aspect of humanness. Finally, if German *Volkskunde* were to become *Kulturanthropologie*, following the American tradition that subsumes all anthropological fields—cultural, physical, linguistic, archaeological—into one, what would be *Volkskunde*'s status vis-à-vis *Ethnologie*? *Kulturanthropologie* would be a problematic choice for the *Volkskunde*'s new identity, then, precisely because it would erode the boundary with what was, in the international context, the field's most immediate neighbor.

In this sense, the problem posed by Erixon's term *Europäische Ethnologie*—debated in the 1950s and solidifying in the 1960s as different regional traditions in Europe were adopting it as their field's name[649]—was ultimately the same problem posed by *Kulturanthropologie*. The boundary between *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde*, which had by then seamlessly transitioned to *Ethnologie*, was recognized by the Falkenstein participants as the most salient boundary of all. Nonetheless, the pressure to internationalize—whether adopting the American or the European paradigm—simultaneously put pressure on a boundary that was never quite fully solidified.[650] Even Riehl himself had used *Volkskunde* and *Ethnologie* interchangeably, recalled one

---

[648] See especially Ibid., 291–299.

[649] At the Falkenstein meeting, Günter Wiegelmann recounts how the Scandinavian *Volkskundler* formally changed their name to *Ethnologie* that very summer. Eastern Europe already used *Ethnologie* when communicating with the West. The French were moving toward *Europäische Ethnologie* with the founding of the Paris-based SIEF Journal *Ethnologia Europaea*, and the Portuguese were at that moment deciding between *Kulturanthropologie* and *Ethnologie*. Ibid., 296–297.

[650] This point is reiterated in Lutz, "Volkskunde und Ethnologie"; Lutz, "Deutsche Volkskunde und europäische Ethnologie: Zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der 50er Jahre."

participant.[651] If the term *Ethnologie* was by now already occupied by *Völkerkunde*, as Bausinger concluded,[652] and *Kulturanthropologie* was by definition a combination of the two traditionally separate ethnological disciplines in Germany, then what option was left for a new name that was descriptive of the field's new theoretical orientation, sufficiently unique to set it apart from *Ethnologie*, and yet internationally comprehensible as part of the global anthropological community and not just of folklore studies?

As was discussed in Chapter 2, the conference participants could not agree on a single way forward. *Kulturanthropologie* won the final naming vote, yet, as noted in Chapter 3, it did not become the uniform, or even the dominant title for *Volkskunde* institutes following the debate. The reality was, the number of conference attendees was too small to be representative of the field as a whole. Indeed, a 1971 survey of German-speaking *Volkskundler* ultimately revealed that the majority of practicing scholars in fact preferred "*Volkskunde* (*Europäische Ethnologie*)"—a hybrid of two native European terms—over the American gloss.[653] Even Greverus's institute would bear the double name Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie.

Mirroring the trend among other Europeanist anthropologies in Europe, *Europäische Ethnologie* would became the most common institute title as well as the typical umbrella term for the field when discussing Germany's tradition from an international perspective. More precisely, though, *Volkskunde* became and remains a so-called "*Vielnamenfach*" whose internal diversity, emblemized by a variety of often hyphenated institute titles, is now posited, at least internally, as a sign of rigor (see

---

[651] Brückner, *Falkensteiner Protokolle*, 295. Wiegelmann, Zender and Heilfurth recall this problematic historical point also in their 1977 introduction to the field. Wiegelmann, Zender, and Heilfurth, *Volkskunde*, 13.

[652] Brückner, *Falkensteiner Protokolle*, 298.

[653] *dgv-Informationen* 80, no. 1 (1971) cited in Wiegelmann, Zender, and Heilfurth, *Volkskunde*, 9.

Chapter 3). But, as will be discussed in the next section, the international politics of science was not the only pressure influencing how the field reformed its outside identity. The disciplinary histories of these sciences themselves played a role in creating a provenance for another strategy of naming.

EUROPÄISCHE ETHNOLOGIE AS CONTESTED TERRITORY

Across the postwar historiography of the field, it is reiterated that from its nineteenth-century origins, *Volkskunde* has occupied a theoretical, methodological, and ideological space between the humanities and the social sciences—a "*Zwischenfach*," in the words of Wiegelmann, Zender, and Heilfurth.[654] On the one hand, it finds its roots in the folklore and linguistic archiving of the Brothers Grimm. On the other hand, as noted above, even Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl used the term interchangeably with *Ethnologie*. *Volkskunde*'s continuing medial position would be captured, for example, in Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann's 1969 introduction to the field, *Deutsche Volkskunde zwischen Germanistik und Sozialwissenschaft*. Noting in the forward that the name *Volkskunde* evokes an impression of nostalgia for folklife, and so can present a barrier to joining the "Chor moderner Wissenschaftsbereiche," Weber-Kellermann sets as her express purpose in the book to show how *Volkskunde* was transforming methodologically in the direction of the social sciences. At the same time, Weber-Kellermann posits the field as still closely aligned with *Germanistik* and the humanities in general, in concerning itself both with folk poetry and contemporary literature.[655]

---

654 Ibid., 38.

655 "Choir of modern scientific fields." Weber-Kellermann, *Deutsche Volkskunde zwischen Germanistik und Sozialwissenschaften*, v. According to Hermann Bausinger, *Volkskunde*'s international connections in the 1960s were still largely pursued via the field's traditional connection with *Germanistik* and philology. This tendency had not only to do with the fact that *Volkskundler* were typically also trained in *Germanistik*;

Wiegelmann, Zender, and Heilfurth's 1977 introduction to *Volkskunde* likewise frames the field in terms of its interdisciplinary boundary relations. With *Völkerkunde und Kulturanthropologie* (which they gloss as Cultural Anthropology in parentheses), *Volkskunde* shares a common object: *Kultur*. With the humanities in Germany, it shares a common cultural region. The reality of *Volkskunde*'s many overlaps with neighboring disciplines, however, is viewed by the authors as both an advantage and a danger ("Gefahr") to the integrity of a comparatively small field. They explain: "Through its numerous neighboring disciplines the field has the chance for stimulation and cooperation from many sides, but also the temptation to splinter, to take up all too quickly themes that are current in other fields at the moment."[656] In this way, they indicate that interdisciplinarity is a danger that could well eventually undermine the scientific integrity of the field by encouraging splintering into subsets of adjacent fields. As a consequence, Wiegelmann et al. believe that *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* appears not to possess a theoretical, methodological, or thematic territory all its own, making it difficult for students and other outsiders to grasp the core of the discipline.[657] Thus, their introduction represents a perspective between views of the field as unfortunately fractured after Falkenstein and the present positive evaluation of its unity in diversity.

With the second edition of Weber-Kellermann's introduction, published in 1985, the title shifted the site of *Volkskunde*'s liminality from *Germanistik* /

---

as recounted above, anxiety about the boundary with *Ethnologie* also hindered connections with other national anthropological traditions, at least at first. Bausinger, *Ein Aufklärer des Alltags*, 135.

[656] "Durch die Vielzahl der Nachbardisziplinen hat das Fach die Chance zu vielseitiger Anregung und Kooperation, aber auch die Versuchung zur Zersplitterung, zu allzu raschem Aufgreifen von Themen, die in anderen Fächern gerade aktuell sind." Wiegelmann, Zender, and Heilfurth, *Volkskunde*, 232.

[657] Ibid., 11, 232.

Sozialwissenschaften to *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie*.[658] In one sense, the switch from *Volkskunde* as a *Zwischenfach* to *Volkskunde* as one half of a hybrid field with *Europäische Ethnologie* reflects the 1971 naming vote, suggesting that the field had settled to a degree on a new identity, straddling the traditional German name and the Erixonian Europeanist model. But the title of the book's central section title, "Von der Deutschen Volkskunde zur Europäischen Ethnologie,"[659] indicates how, between the late 1960s and the early 1980s, the boundary with the humanities—history, linguistics, and literature studies—was no longer as salient for a field fighting its past by shoring up an identity as a social science: an ethnology of Europe.

Crossing that border requires a significantly different kind of translation of the discipline's master narratives, one implicating other factors already discussed. This translation of the Erixonian notion to suit the West German situation was not only a matter of rejoining the European anthropological ecumene. It also was a response to emerging cultural phenomena. Not long after the end of World War II era, Western Europe began a process of economic integration starting with the Marshall Plan and European Coal and Steel Community, as well as political integration, with the solidification of East and West Cold War Blocs. This geopolitical "Europeanization" would accelerate significantly with the end of the Cold War and the establishment of the European Union and similar supranational bodies and initiatives. In addition, this period saw an unprecedented advancing of the globalization of the flows of peoples, goods, and ideas through German and European space.[660]

---

[658] Weber-Kellermann, *Einführung in die Volkskunde, Europäische Ethnologie*. This title was retained in the third edition: Weber-Kellermann, Bimmer, and Becker, *Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie*. It is notable that the volumes are published in the J.B. Metzler series, dedicated to literature and humanities topics. See https://www.metzlerverlag.de/.

[659] Weber-Kellermann, Bimmer, and Becker, *Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie*, 137–191.

[660] For a thorough overview of the transformation of Europe after World War II, see Judt, *Postwar*.

These economic and political shifts, and the cultural trends they ushered in, began turning the attention of *Volkskundler* to transnational issues like migration, ethnic minorities, multiculturalism, Europeanization, and tourism—research areas that have only expanded since the 1970s.[661] Certain institutes, moreover, began to build a research and teaching profile that emphasized a Europeanist or transnationalist focus. This was the case for the Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie, for example.[662] There, Ina-Maria Greverus reformed a program in German folk studies into one centered on the plural and dynamic qualities of culture at the level of everyday life

---

[661] Among the first large-scale discussions of migration as a site of *Volkskunde* research was a 1971 conference at Trier, documented in Kai Detlev Sievers, "Migration: Fünf Jahrhunderte Wanderungsbewegungen der Föhringer," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 68 (1972): 213–35. On cultural identity in intercultural comparison, see, for instance, the collection of articles in the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 73 (1977). See also Dieter Kramer, "Aspekte der Kulturgeschichte des Tourismus," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 78, no. 1 (1982): 1–13; Ueli Gyr, "Touristenkultur und Reisealltag: Volkskundlicher Nachholbedarf in der Tourismusforschung," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 84 (1988): 224–40; Hans Schuhladen, "Wieviel Vielfalt ertragen wir? Zur Pluralität der multikulturellen Gesellschaft," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 90, no. 1 (1994): 37–58; Werner Schiffauer, "Die Angst vor der Differenz: Zur neuen Strömungen in der Kulturanthropologie," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 92, no. 1 (1996): 20–31; Reinhard Johler, "'Europa in Zahlen': Statistik—Vergleich—Volkskunde—EU," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 95, no. 2 (1999): 246–63. Exemplary monographs on transnational topics have proliferated since the 1990s, with works by *Europäische Ethnologen* at the Humboldt University of Berlin and the University of Frankfurt am Main making a sizeable contribution to that body. For an interdisciplinary collaboration on the topic of cultural diversity in Europe spearheaded by German *Europäische Ethnologen*, see Reinhard Johler et al., eds., *Europa und seine Fremden: Die Gestaltung kultureller Vielfalt als Herausforderung* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2007). For more information on these trends, and how the turn to the transnational and the European is situated in introductory texts, see Weber-Kellermann, Bimmer, and Becker, *Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie*, 194–195; Kaschuba, *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*, 108–111.

[662] Of course, the Institute at Frankfurt am Main is not the only one to have taken up such intercultural and transnational questions. Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, for instanced, worked on a concept of "Interethnik" at the University of Marburg, Weber-Kellermann, *Zur Interethnik*. Leopold Kretzenbacher, meanwhile, established a tradition of comparative (*vergleichende*) *Volkskunde* at the University of Munich, Helge Gerndt, "Vergleichende Volkskunde: Zur Bedeutung des Vergleichs in der volkskundlichen Methodik. Leopold Kretzenbacher zum 60. Geburtstag," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 68 (1972): 179–95; Helge Gerndt, Leopold Kretzenbacher, and Georg R. Schroubek, *Vergleichende Volkskunde: Bibliographie Leopold Kretzenbacher aus Anlass seines 65. Geburtstages*, vol. 1, 2 vols. (Würzburg: Bayerische Blätter für Volkskunde, 1977); Helge Gerndt and Elfriede Grabner, *Leopold Kretzenbacher—Vergleichende Volkskunde Europas: Gesamtbibliographie mit Register, 1936–1999* (Münster: Waxmann, 2000). And the Institut für Europäische Ethnologie at the Humboldt University of Berlin by now has produced numerous publications and runs multiple simultaneously running research projects on transnational topics. See https://www.euroethno.hu-berlin.de/de/forschung.

("*Alltagswelt*").[663] Armed with a basic conceptual framework built upon German phenomenology (especially the work of Alfred Schütz) and American cultural anthropology, Greverus and her students took to studying everyday phenomena of cultural identity-making and intercultural contact through regular fieldwork experience—what she called "*forschendes Lernen*" (research-based learning).[664]

Exemplifying how Germany's *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* began solidifying its Europeanist identity, Greverus's students went on to become leading researchers in the areas of migration, Europeanization, and globalization.[665] However,

---

[663] On Greverus's plan for the institute's curriculum, see Greverus, "Zu einem Curriculum für das Fachgebiet Kulturanthropologie"; Ina-Maria Greverus, "Über Kultur und Alltagswelt," *Ethnologia Europaea* 9, no. 2 (1976): 199–211. See also her introduction to the field, Greverus, *Kultur und Alltagswelt*. On the institute's focus on issues of intercultural contact and conflict, see the conference proceedings Ina-Maria Greverus, Konrad Köstlin, and Heinz Schilling, eds., *Kulturkontakt, Kulturkonflikt: Zur Erfahrung des Fremden. 26. Deutscher Volkskundekongress in Frankfurt vom 28. September bis 2. Oktober 1987*, vol. 1 (Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie der Universität Frankfurt am Main, 1988); Ina-Maria Greverus, Konrad Köstlin, and Heinz Schilling, eds., *Kulturkontakt, Kulturkonflikt: Zur Erfahrung des Fremden. 26. Deutscher Volkskundekongress in Frankfurt vom 28. September bis 2. Oktober 1987*, vol. 2 (Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie der Universität Frankfurt am Main, 1988).

[664] Greverus, *Forschendes Lernen und der Studentenberg*. "*Forschendes Lernen*" continues to be central to the department's degree program. See Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, "Studiengänge: Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie," *Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main: Studienangebot*, accessed March 13, 2015, https://www.uni-frankfurt.de/36027018/kult1; Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, "Lehrforschungsprojekte," *Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie*, accessed March 13, 2015, http://kaee.uni-frankfurt.de/?page_id=89.

[665] See, for instance, Gisela Welz, *Inszenierungen kultureller Vielfalt: Frankfurt am Main und New York City* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1996); Gisela Welz and Annina Lottermann, eds., *Projekte der Europäisierung: Kulturanthropologische Forschungsperspektiven* (Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, 2009); Ina-Maria Greverus, Regina Römhild, and Gisela Welz, eds., *The Mediterraneans: Transborder Movements and Diasporas* (Münster: LIT, 2001); Regina Römhild, *Histourismus: Fremdenverkehr und lokale Selbstbehauptung* (Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie der Universität Frankfurt, 1990); Gisela Welz and Petra Ilyes, eds., *Zypern: Gesellschaftliche Öffnung, europäische Integration, Globalisierung* (Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, 2001); Regina Römhild, *Die Macht des Ethnischen: Grenzfall Russlanddeutsche. Perspektiven einer politischen Anthropologie* (Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1998); Greverus, *Anthropologisch reisen*; Welz, "Ethnografien europäischer Modernen"; Regina Römhild, "Ethnografie und Imagination: Das neue europäische Grenzregime als Forschungsfeld," in *Grenzen und Differenzen: Zur Macht sozialer und kultureller Grenzziehungen*, ed. Thomas Hengartner and Johannes Moser (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2006), 175–84; Welz, Gisela, "Moving Targets: Feldforschung unter Mobilitätsdruck," *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 94, no. 2 (1998): 177–94; Gisela

just as the field was expanding its plane of inquiry, the same boundary-crossing cultural trends also piqued the interest of the traditionally non-Europeanist *Ethnologen* (*Völkerkundler*). *Ethnologie*'s turn to Europe beginning in the 1960s was provoked also in no small part by the international influence of British social anthropology and American cultural anthropology as they articulated the crisis of ethnographic representation, initiated a reflexive turn, and expanded their purview to Europe in the 1960s/70s, as well.[666] In consequence, besides *Volkskunde*'s movement toward *Europäische Ethnologie* as the site of its internationalized disciplinary identity and Europe as a field for comparative or transnational research, a minor, but growing movement of *Ethnologen* toward Europe goaded a stronger orientation among *Volkskundler* toward policing that interdisciplinary boundary.

The story of the two fields' convergence on Europe—the "stepchild" of ethnological research for both fields until the 1960s[667]—was captured in a 1982 workshop arranged by Heide Nixdorff and Thomas Hauschild, both of the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde. In a discipline whose focus was still almost exclusively on sites and peoples outside Europe, scholars like Hauschild and Nixdorf—trained in both

---

Welz, "Beyond Tradition: Anthropology, Social Change, and Tourism in Cyprus.," *Peace Research Abstracts* 38, no. 4 (2001): 451–600; Gisela Welz, "Transnational Cultures and Multiple Modernities: Anthropology's Encounter with Globalization," *Zeitschrift Für Anglistik Und Amerikanistik* 52, no. 4 (2004): 409; Regina Römhild, "Home-Made Cleavages: Ethnonational Discourse, Diasporization, and the Politics of Germanness," *Anthropological Journal on European Cultures* 8 (1999): 99–120; Römhild, "Confronting the Logic of the Nation-State: Transnational Migration and Cultural Globalisation in Germany"; Regina Römhild, "Topografien des Glücks: An den Kreuzungen von Migration und Tourismus," in *Paradies: Topografien der Sehnsucht*, ed. Manuela Gerlo and Claudia Benthien (Cologne: Böhlau, 2010), 217–30; Regina Römhild, "Nach der 'Gastarbeit': Transitgesellschaft Europa," in *Projekt Migration*, ed. Kölnischer Kunstverein (Cologne: Dumont, 2005), 92–97; Regina Römhild, "Fremdzuschreibungen-Selbstpositionierungen: Die Praxis der Ethnisierung im Alltag der Einwanderungsgesellschaft," in *Ethnizität und Migration: Einführung in Wissenschaft und Arbeitsfelder*, ed. Brigitta Schmidt-Lauber (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 2006), 157–77.

666 Heide Nixdorff, "Vorwort," in *Europäische Ethnologie*, ed. Heide Nixdorff and Thomas Hauschild (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1982), 9.

667 Ibid.

fields, conducted research in Europe,[668] but whose professional paths mainly followed *Ethnologie*—still form a precarious minority.[669] For them, to define *Europäische Ethnologie* as a legitimate field of research with interdisciplinary and international reach was a serious matter of professional politics. For the participants from departments of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie*, whose work typically went unnoticed by the numerically larger discipline of *Ethnologie*, it was an opportunity to showcase what unique and valuable perspectives they bring to the table—to gain legitimacy in the eyes of the discipline that threatened to absorb them.

Twenty-five scholars from nine countries attended (including the GDR and Hungary representing the East Bloc) to discuss the topics of disciplinary history and boundaries, fieldwork methods, and historical methods. Among the attendees representing *Volkskunde* were Ina-Maria Greverus (Frankfurt am Main), Gottfried Korff (Tübingen), Gerhard Lutz (Hamburg), Helge Gerndt (Munich), Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann (Marburg), and Günter Wiegelmann (Münster)—all figures responsible for forming the field's institutional memory through the 1960s/70s. Among the Europeanist *Ethnologen* present were Ulla Johansen and Waltraud Kokot (Cologne). Also in attendance were *Ethnologie* students Dorle Dracklé (Hamburg) and Barbara Wolbert

---

[668] Hauschild's fieldwork, for example, took place on the Mediterranean as well as in Germany. See, for instance, Thomas Hauschild, *Der böse Blick: Ideengeschichtliche und sozialpsychologische Untersuchungen* (Berlin: Verlag Mensch und Leben, 1982); Thomas Hauschild, *Magie und Macht in Italien: Über Frauenzauber, Kirche und Politik* (Gifkendorf: Merlin, 2002); Thomas Hauschild, *Charisma, Stigma und der Dritte: Politisches Heil in einer subalternen Kultur der katholischen Welt* (Konstanz: Univ. SFB 485, 2004); Thomas Hauschild, *Ritual und Gewalt: Ethnologische Studien an europäischen und mediterranen Gesellschaften* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2008). As an example of his collaboration with scholars of *Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie*, see Thomas Hauschild and Bernd Jürgen Warneken, eds., *Inspecting Germany: Internationale Deutschland-Ethnographie der Gegenwart* (Münster: LIT, 2002).

[669] Among other German *Ethnologen* working principally in Europe today are Dorle Dracklé (Bremen), Dieter Haller (Bochum), Barbara Wolbert (Frankfurt an der Oder), Werner Schiffauer (Frankfurt an der Oder), Werner Krauss (Hamburg), and Waltraud Kokot (Hamburg). See Haller, *Die Suche nach dem Fremden*, 295.

(Cologne), who would go on to take positions in university institutes that combine the two German traditions under one departmental curriculum.

To that point, however, *Volkskundler* and Europeanist *Ethnologen* had been studying contemporary Europe without acknowledging one another's work. The purpose of the workshop, then, was to raise to mutual visibility their respective research in this now common research field. Hauschild introduces the conference volume by intoning the 1955 Arnhem meeting and its call for recasting the various nativist anthropology traditions as a regional, European, and Europeanist *Ethnologie*, ordered together with *Völkerkunde* under the general heading of *Ethnologie*.[670] However, it would be inaccurate to consider the Berlin meeting as West Germany's belated answer to the Europeanizing, interdisciplinary initiative at Arnhem. For, rather than aiming to finally establish a single general anthropology with a Europeanist subfield, the goal there was much simpler: to provide a forum for scholars from the two fields to learn about each others' approach to studying culture and to identify points of resonance upon which to build an ongoing scholarly exchange between the two disciplines.

Dieter Haller recently described the relationship between *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* as a tragic case of missed encounters, with resistance to collaboration exerted from both sides that only increased after 1945.[671] For the conference participants, this disjuncture meant that the search for common ground in the present would only find limited inspiration from the past. How they remembered the fields' contact history reveals much about how the two disciplines continue to construct themselves over against one another. Presenters recalled how the word *Ethnologie* had been applied to both

[670] Thomas Hauschild, "Zur Einführung—Formen Europäischer Ethnologie," in *Europäische Ethnologie*, ed. Heide Nixdorff and Thomas Hauschild (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1982), 11.
[671] Haller, *Die Suche nach dem Fremden*, 35. Here, Haller also cites Thomas Hauschild, "Volkskunde und Völkerkunde," *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Völkerkunde* 36 (2006), http://www.evifa.de/cms/fileadmin/uploads/dgvoe_forum_texte/Beitrag_Hauschild_13-05-06.pdf.

Völkerkunde and *Volkskunde* in the first century of their fields' development, setting them apart from the neighboring fields of geography and history. Yet, by the mid-nineteenth century, the term was associated almost exclusively with *Völkerkunde*, which was pursuing a unified track of primitivist-evolutionist research. Meanwhile *Volkskunde* developed into a nationalist-philological science, with connections to the study of literature, history, and religion. What the conference attendees were able to agree upon was that *Ethnologie* and *Völkerkunde* were not synonyms after all, but should be distinguished as a research orientation and a disciplinary tradition, respectively. In that way, both *Volkskundler* and *Völkerkundler* could call themselves *Ethnologen* (ethnologists).

But these disciplinary siblings were not completely comfortable with the new narrative. When it came to the history of how the two fields converged on Europe, the attending *Völkerkundler* were eager to claim the status of their field having provided the original impetus, for theirs was the original comparative discipline, it was argued, and Mediterranean research was tied to its inception. But it also was contended that *Volkskunde* was encroaching on topics originally explored by *Völkerkunde*, like immigration and acculturation, and not the other way around. Ultimately, the emergence of a common anthropology of Europe was credited to international scholarly exchange, a conversation that actually began in the 1920s/30s, but from which Germany was excluded through World War II into the 1950s, and from which German *Volkskundler* were remembered as having deliberately exited at Arnhem in 1955.[672] Even by the 1980s, it was recognized, a great deal of interaction between German *Volkskunde* and

[672] See Lutz, "Die Entstehung der Ethnologie und das spätere Nebeneinander der Fächer Volkskunde und Völkerkunde in Deutschland."

Völkerkunde occurred only via their engagement with Scandinavian, British and American anthropology.

With respect to points of contact in theory and methodology, Europeanist ethnologists in both fields found common ground in their unique position vis-à-vis the crisis of ethnographic representation, a philosophical and practical turn associated with Anglophone cultural anthropology that called researchers to recognize the impossibility of objectively representing the cultural Other and to practice reflexivity regarding their relationship to a field of culture, no matter how familiar or foreign it is to the researcher.[673] Hence, the crisis of representation was an occasion to bring into conversation the two disciplines' respective approaches to the question of Self and Other in fieldwork, to navigate an epistemic turn and conceive of a new ethics of ethnographic field work together.

But as successful as the conference was for generating fruitful exchange over methods and theory, anxiety over disciplinary boundaries lingered, especially for the

---

[673] On the crisis of ethnographic representation and the reflexive turn in cultural anthropology, see, for instance, Dell H. Hymes, *Reinventing Anthropology*, 1st ed. (New York: Pantheon, 1972); Jay Ruby, *A Crack in the Mirror: Reflexive Perspectives in Anthropology* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982); Vincent Crapanzano, *Tuhami: Portrait of a Moroccan* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980); Paul Rabinow, *Reflections on Fieldwork in Morocco*, Quantum Book (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977); Clifford Geertz, *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author* (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 1988); Michael A. Rynkiewich and James P. Spradley, *Ethics and Anthropology: Dilemmas in Fieldwork* (New York: Wiley, 1976); Gerrit Huizer, Bruce Mannheim, and International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, eds., *The Politics of Anthropology: From Colonialism and Sexism toward a View from Below* (The Hague: Mouton, 1979); Michel Leiris, *Das Auge des Ethnographen*, Ethnologische Schriften (Frankfurt am Main: Syndikat, 1981); George E. Marcus and Michael M.J. Fischer, *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1986); James Clifford and George E. Marcus, *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California, 1986). The seminal German contribution on the topic—required reading for most students of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie*, according to my interviewees—is Lindner, "Angst des Forschers." Ina-Maria Greverus has also worked extensively on the problem of researcher reflexivity. See, most recently, Ina-Maria Greverus, "Touching Life: Anthropological Encounters with Aesthetics," in *Aesthetics and Anthropology: Performing Life—Performed Lives*, ed. Ina Maria Greverus and Ute Ritschel, trans. Amanda Randall (Münster: LIT, 2009), 27–96.

Volkskundler. Claims about which discipline began to examine which region or topic first, as well as the airing of mutual preconceptions, betrayed a persistaent power imbalance based on research and funding, not only on provenance. One presenter tried to relieve the tension by citing research funding statistics to show that *Ethnologie* was not encroaching significantly on the research terrain of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie*, regionally or topically. Several others also emphasized that, because both disciplines were small, neither one could successfully dominate the other. Indeed, those representing *Völkerkunde* insisted that collaboration was necessary for both fields to resist domination by larger neighboring disciplines like sociology, linguistics, psychology or history, not to mention the internationally dominant British and American schools of cultural anthropology.

In the conference's concluding remarks, Thomas Hauschild professed hope for an ongoing conversation. There had been no illusions that the two disciplines might become one. As a consequence, the discussion of the institutional relationship between them focused mainly on why and how to maintain the boundary, not whether and how to dissolve it. No one wanted to change the traditional disciplinary system—only to find channels for collaboration within it. But because there were and are so few Europeanists among the *Völkerkundler* / *Ethnologen* and only a portion of *Volkskundler* / *Europäische Ethnologen* work comparatively beyond the German-speaking realms such collaboration would have to be on the initiative of individual researchers and projects, not entire departments or professional organizations.

In the thirty years since it took place, the 1982 workshop has come to occupy an ambivalent place in institutional memory that captures the increasing complexity of German *Volkskunde*'s position in interdisciplinary and international relations—within Germany, among European anthropological traditions, and within the global

anthropological community that is dominated by the Anglophone traditions. Some historiography posits the conference—or rather, its proceedings—as mainly a resource for historical information about the field's past: how and why the two fields emerged as they did, as well as how and why *Volkskunde* itself splintered in ways that would draw parts of the field into a shared sphere with *Ethnologie.*[674] Though not entirely lost in institutional amnesia, without having made an impression on institutional structures, the Berlin workshop, like the Arnhem conference, occupies a marginal place in much of the field's subsequent historiography.

Still, some historiographers, like Wolfgang Kaschuba, view the conference as a watershed moment in which the two fields recognized their connectedness on more than methodological grounds, in terms of their shared valuing of ethnographic reflexivity concerning the cultural Other.[675] However, like the attendees themselves, Kaschuba has no illusions, and in fact no interest, in the fields converging: their respective "handwriting" is simply too different, he says. Even so, their differences ought not to be understood in the negative, he insists, for it is precisely by maintaining the boundary between them that the two intellectual traditions can enrich each others' and the public's understandings of Self and Other.[676]

Utz Jeggle puts a different spin on the workshop's significance, positing it as a first sign of hope that *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* would work more closely together on researching problems of Germany's and Europe's contemporary, multicultural society. Indeed, such a partnership is necessary, he warns, for:

---

[674] See, for instance, Zimmermann, *Empirische Kulturwissenschaft, Europäische Ethnologie, Kulturanthropologie, Volkskunde*, 12; Weber-Kellermann, Bimmer, and Becker, *Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie*, 19, 205.
[675] Kaschuba, *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*, 110.
[676] Ibid., 110–111.

> The danger of narrowing the perspective of Volkskunde through the constant analysis of one's own cultural problems is not to be overlooked . . . Ethnologie does not teach the idealization of the Other, implying a devaluation of the self; rather, it shows that all cultural problems have various possible solutions . . . and that ethnocentrism, which for a long time dominated Volkskunde, makes a culture not only more dangerous, but also poorer.[677]

Jeggle's interpretation of the need for this line of interdisciplinary cooperation serves as a reminder of the dire consequences of *Volkskunde*'s not so distant overinvestment in national culture. But the basic message of Jeggle and Kaschuba is the same: if *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* are to be of use to society, then they must collaborate.

While the 1982 workshop was a success in finding common ground in ethnographic reflexivity, Regina Bendix has argued that it failed to attain reflexivity "on the problems of European ethnology of the present and future."[678] By this she means that the attendees did not divine any answers to their own question of what "*Europäische Ethnologie*" could be. Like the 1970 meeting of *Volkskundler* at Falkenstein and the 1955 international conference at Arnhem, when it came to mobilizing historical and present bridge points between different traditions of anthropology to affect structural change, the 1982 workshop ended in an impasse, with all parties going their own way again. Yet, even though the fields were not fully bridged, the 1982 conference is remembered as a turning point: by that time, *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* had established an identity narrative strong enough to bear smaller lines of collaboration across the boundary

---

[677] "Die Gefahr der volkskundlichen Blickverengung bei der stetigen Analyse eigener kultureller Probleme ist nicht zu übersehen. . . . Die Ethnologie lehrt nicht die Idealisierung des Fremden, verbunden mit einer Entwertung des Eigenen, sie zeigt, daß alle kulturellen Probleme verschieden Lösungsmöglichkeiten haben . . . und daß der Ethnozentrismus, der die Volkskunde lange Zeit beherrscht hat, eine Kultur nicht nur gefährlicher, sondern auch ärmer macht." Jeggle, "Volkskunde im 20. Jahrhundert," 69–70.

[678] Regina F. Bendix, "Translating Between European Ethnologies," in *Times, Places, Passages: Ethnological Approaches in the New Millennium*, ed. Attila Paládi-Kovács (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 2004), 376.

with its most threatening neighbor in the form of scholarly networks and individual research and study projects.

SUMMARY

The limited effectiveness of the Arnhem, Falkenstein, and Berlin conferences in establishing a fully Europeanist identity for Germany's *Volkskunde* is a case of an incomplete—even impossible, as some perceive it—translation between that field and other national traditions and neighboring cultural sciences in Germany, in particular *Ethnologie*. The story of Arnhem was largely suppressed in West German institutional memory until the 1982 Berlin meeting, and since then, the definition of *Europäische Ethnologie* still remains in flux in Germany.[679] In many ways, the fault lines of the 1960s debate within the Europe-wide folklore organization SIEF, and among the anthropologies of Europe more generally, continue to be reflected in how *Europäische Ethnologie* is imagined and institutionally instantiated in Germany. It is a matter of disagreements "between those who wanted one unified discipline (European ethnology) and those who wanted to keep folklore [in this case, *Volkskunde*] as a separate discipline, between those who considered general ethnology / anthropology to be the mother discipline and those who saw the disciplines as clearly separate, and between those who wanted the organization to cover the whole world [a fully transnational purview, in other words] and those who saw Europe only as the field." [680]

---

[679] Reinhard Johler recently published a reflection on whether the disciplinary concept of European Ethnology is also still unstable and in fact presently transforming at the shared, international level. Johler, "Doing European Ethnology in a Time of Change: The Metamorphosis of a Discipline (in Germany and Europe)."

[680] International Society for Ethnology and Folklore, "History of SIEF."

As a result, the answer to the question of a common disciplinary identity for German *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* remains today a version of "unity in diversity." However, as the field faces new, outside pressures—both disciplinary and political—in the twenty-first century, that self-narrative must once again undergo translation if disciplinary integrity is to be maintained. The details of the latest translations of the field's institutional memory comprise the topic of the next and final chapter of the dissertation. Not only will it consider possibilities for how emerging trends in international, interdisciplinary boundary-crossing are being inscribed more deeply in institutional memory. It will conclude by demonstrating how the latest historiographic discourses are interacting with emerging national and international public discourses concerning Germany's global identity.

Chapter 7:

Boundary-Crossing as an Emergent Trope of Institutional Memory

In Chapter 6, the discussion of an alternative, overarching trope of boundaries in institutional memory covered a set of historical moments wherein interdisciplinary and international boundary-crossing-points were proffered that could have integrated the field internally and internationally. Yet these opportunities for *Volkskunde* to restructure itself according to a national or international standard were rejected in favor of maintaining internal and external disciplinary boundaries. Remarkably, the permeability of boundaries used to construct the field's *epistemic* structuring provided reinforcement for the maintenance of *Volkskunde*'s *organizational* structuring. That is, the different branches of the field that emerged in the wake of the 1970 Falkenstein debates (the contours of the "*Vielnamenfach*") frequently defended their respective paths as legitimate by invoking (or rejecting) connections to other national and international disciplinary intellectual traditions, in particular Frankfurt School-derived sociology and Anglophone social/cultural anthropology, but also Scandinavian regional folklore studies and an emerging international model of European ethnology (*Europäische Ethnologie*).

In this way, it is shown that *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* is not the sufficient cause of the current structure of the field—*Volkskunde*'s history under Nazism is only part of the history of its present. As the field finds secure footing in a state of scientific and national normalcy, it has become possible, and perhaps even necessary, for a new, broader trope of boundaries to structure *Volkskunde*'s self-narrative. This chapter will examine developments in the field's institutional memory from the 1990s to the present, concluding with an overview and interpretation of the present state of its structures and (his)stories. Specifically, in light of new external pressures—both disciplinary and political—being exerted on the field's organizational structures, and the implications of these for its epistemic structures, the conclusion will speculate about possibilities for what new translations of *Volkskunde*'s identity narratives could be anticipated in the ongoing formation of institutional memory.

The chapter proceeds according to four themes. First, discourses surrounding the relationship between Germany's *Ethnologie* and *Europäische Ethnologie* will be examined in order to introduce how that interdisciplinary boundary in particular remains a point of contention or collaboration broached strategically to define *Volkskunde*'s contemporary identity. The second subsection details the nature of international connections, focusing especially on the German field's ambivalent response to the hegemony of Anglophone social/cultural anthropology, now posited as synonymous with "global" anthropology. The third subsection shifts focus to new pressures on disciplinary identity coming from outside the scientific community. These pressures are exerted both at the national and the international level. As discussed in the last chapter, the cultural phenomena associated with Europeanization and globalization represents one pressure, in this case on the epistemic structure of the field. But another set of pressures also are being exerted by national and supranational political bodies on the field's organizational

structures. The final subsection will thus consider disciplinary identity narratives that are now emerging in response to these present boundary issues.

EUROPÄISCHE ETHNOLOGIE AS PRACTICE, AS BRAND

If, as Gisela Welz suggested in 2004, a discipline's title works like brand recognition,[681] what common product is to be recognized in the many names of Germany's "*Vielnamenfach*"? A look at the departmental and disciplinary profiles described on university institute web pages indeed suggests a diversity of research interests, many broadly overlapping, and all dedicated to the empirical study of culture. Invocations of the many field names prove a means of tracing the boundaries of a scientific community proudly claiming an identity of unity in diversity. Though the field still requires translating[682] for the national or disciplinary outsider—and certainly for novice students, as well—from within it, most practitioners are reflexively comfortable with a disciplinary identity that is diffused across individual institute profiles.

But one also might pose Welz's question to the international title of *Europäische Ethnologie*, the most common of German *Volkskunde*'s many new names since the 1970s. After the 1982 West Berlin meeting of ethnologists studying Europe from the perspectives of Germany's two traditional branches of anthropology (*Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde*), the question of the definition of *Europäische Ethnologie* was not just left unresolved, it was barely problematized. Yes, we are all practicing ethnology, the participants agreed, but this time it was the *Volkskundler* who walked away with the title:

---

[681] Gisela Welz, "Volkskunde, Europäische Ethnologie, Kulturanthropologie: De- und Rekonstruktionen von Disziplinarität," in *Namen und was sie bedeuten: Zur Namensdebatte im Fach Volkskunde*, ed. Regina Bendix and Tatjana Eggeling (Göttingen: Schmerse, 2004), 31.

[682] On the general problem of translating between European ethnologies, see Bendix, "Translating Between European Ethnologies."

Where *Ethnologie* would continue to be the institutional moniker for *Völkerkunde*, *Volkskunde* would occupy *Europäische Ethnologie*. By the early twenty-first century, even those university institutes that retained the traditional name *Volkskunde* in their respective titles now include *Europäische Ethnologie* somehow in the description of what discipline they practice and teach.[683]

Scholarly exchange between the two fields concerning the common research space of Europe, but also surrounding more general theoretical and methodological interests, continues largely in the fashion imagined in Berlin: via networked individuals and individual projects—not isolated *per se*, but with their disciplinary integrity intact. Such interactions also take place within the scope of larger interdisciplinary and international forums,[684] yet, as before, such productive rapprochement remains the exception, not the rule.

---

[683] See, for instance, the websites of the Institut für Volkskunde at the Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, which only adopted *Europäische Ethnologie* as its disciplinary description in 2003 (https://www.eu-ethno.uni-freiburg.de/institut-1/europaeische-ethnologie-in-freiburg); the Kultur-anthropologie / Volkskunde division of the Institut für Archäologie und Kulturanthropologie at the Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn (http://www.volkskunde.uni-bonn.de/?set_language=de); the Lehrstuhl für Vergleichende Kulturwissenschaft at the University of Regensburg (translated as "Chair of Comparative European Ethnology) (http://www.uni-regensburg.de/sprache-literatur-kultur/vergleichende-kulturwissenschaft/startseite/index.html); and the Kulturanthropologie/Volkskunde division of the Institut für Film-, Theater- und empirische Kulturwissenschaft at the Johannes Gutenberg Universität Mainz (http://www.kulturanthropologie.uni-mainz.de/21.php). Even the Tübingen Institut für Empirische Kulturwissenschaft presents itself as one with the field of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* (http://www.wiso.uni-tuebingen.de/faecher/empirische-kulturwissenschaft/institut.html).

A remarkable exception to this pattern is the self-presentation of the Institut für Volkskunde / Kulturanthropologie at the Universität Hamburg, which does not mention the word ethnology / *Ethnologie*, but seems rather to circumlocute the term in the description of its focus as "eine empirische Kulturforschung, die europäische Gesellschaften in gegenwartsbezogener und historischer Perspektive in den Blick nimmt" (https://www.kultur.uni-hamburg.de/vk/ueber-das-institut.html). The main image of its profile page—a picture of sign bearing its original name, Institut für Volkskunde—furthermore suggests that the institute's leadership remains invested in the field's historical identity, even as they pursue contemporary cultural studies.

[684] See, for instance, Hauschild and Warneken, *Inspecting Germany*; Gisela Welz, "Europa: Ein Kontinent—Zwei Ethnologien," in *Ethnologie im 21. Jahrhundert*, ed. Thomas Bierschenk, Matthias Krings, and Carola Lentz, 1. Aufl. (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 2013), 211–27. *Europäische Ethnologen* and German *Ethnologen* also will be participating together in a five-panel series on German Studies and ethnography (co-organized by the author) at the 2015 German Studies Association meeting in Washington,

Europeanist ethnologists trained and working in either or both field(s) also encounter each other in the professional conferences and publications of supranational ethnology organizations. The most prominent of these in Europe— SIEF (International Society for Ethnology and Folklore) and EASA (European Association of Social Anthropologists)[685]—each operates with its own definition of European ethnology. In 2001, transnational folklorist Regina Bendix,[686] then vice president of SIEF (president from 2001–2008) and soon-to-be chair of the Institut für Kulturanthropologie / Europäische Ethnologie at the University of Göttingen, defined "European ethnology" in the international sense as being:

> neither a trendy accompaniment to Europe's economic transformation, nor a dangerous political tool in a transforming Europe. Rather, it can be an intellectually worthwhile endeavor engendered by scholarship's traditional place as a voice contributing to transforming polities. An alert European ethnology is likely to both assist and critically comment on the growth of a European polity. Simultaneously, however, I wish to insist that such a European ethnology is only feasible as an addition, not a replacement of extant national ethnologies and it can only emerge out of their collaboration.[687]

D.C. It should also be mentioned at this juncture that conversations between *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* and other fields also are ongoing. See, for instance, Christine Burckhardt-Seebass, ed., *Zwischen den Stühlen fest im Sattel? Eine Diskussion um Zentrum, Perspektiven und Verbindungen des Faches Volkskunde. Hochschultagung der dfv, 31. Oktober–2. November 1996 in Basel*, Beiheft der dgv 5 (Göttingen: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, 1997); Thomas Scheffer and Christian Meyer, "Tagungsbericht: Soziologische vs. ethnologische Ethnographie—Zur Belastbarkeit und Perspektive einer Unterscheidung. Institut für Europäische Ethnologie (IfEE) der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, 21. bis 22. Mai 2010," *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 12, no. 1, art. 25 (January 2011), http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1620/3123.

685 The European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA, founded 1989) would add the study of European culture to the repertoire of the various European traditions of social and cultural anthropology, including German-speaking *Ethnologie*. European Association of Social Anthropologists et al., "EASA Beyond Crises: Continuities and Innovations in European Anthropology. On the History of the EASA," *EASA—European Association of Social Anthropologists*, 2014, http://www.easaonline.org/about/history.shtml.

686 Prior to assuming the professorship at Göttingen, Bendix taught as Professor of Folklore at the University of Pennsylvania. Though born and raised in Switzerland, all of her postsecondary degrees are from universities in the United States. See her curriculum vitae at http://www.uni-goettingen.de/de/biographische-daten/196062.html.

687 Bendix, "Translating Between European Ethnologies," 371.

Ideally, Bendix imagined, "study and research networks will bring about ethnologists with multiple identifications, individuals who have allegiances to both local and supralocal research concerns." To achieve this state, Bendix insists on a disciplinary reflexivity that would have ethnologists in and of Europe understand themselves the way they understand contemporary culture: not as "hermetically sealed," but rather in terms of "the multiply and strategically composed processes of self-fashioning that are replacing more coherent . . . cultural identities."[688] This definition seems to apply well to those *Grenzgänger* scholars from Germany's two ethnological traditions who take the space and image of Europe as their common research site.[689]

The German *Ethnologen* who study European culture—who still comprise a small, yet well-connected regional specialist community—find in SIEF and EASA a common sphere of anthropological inquiry. Within those organizations, "European ethnology" is cast, on the one hand, as the international partner to national folklore (SIEF's model), and, on the other hand, as a regional specialization of the mother discipline, ethnology (EASA). In this way, Germany's *Volkskundler* and *Ethnologen* studying Europe have found supranational organizational spaces of interaction that allow flexibility in how they choose to translate their work into international anthropological nomenclatures. German *Volkskundler* have come to prominence within SIEF in the last two decades, through leadership of the organization, as well as in editorship and authorship in its publishing organs, especially *Ethnologia Europaea*.[690] EASA,

[688] Ibid., 377.

[689] In his 2012 history of *Völkerkunde* / *Ethnologie*, 1945–1990, Dieter Haller lists Thomas Hauschild, Dorle Drackle, Waltraud Kokot, Werner Schiffauer, and himself as ethnologists who study Europe from the disciplinary position of *Ethnologie*. As *Grenzgänger* from the field of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* who meet them in the middle he lists Ina-Maria Greverus, Gisela Welz, Michi Knecht, and Christian Giordano. Haller, *Die Suche nach dem Fremden*, 294–295.

[690] Regina Bendix (Göttingen) and Konrad Köstlin (Tübingen) have served as president of the organization, and Peter Niedermüller (HU-Berlin) and Monique Scheer (Tübingen) have served on the executive board. Former editors of *Ethnologia Europaea* include Regina Bendix and Peter Niedermüller

meanwhile, tends to be populated by *Ethnologen*, Europeanist and non-Europeanist, though the German presence is not as strong as other national anthropologies in Europe. Among the Europeanists engaged there, Dorle Dracklé served on the Executive Committee from 2003–2006.

However, there have been instances where EASA has served as a meeting place of ethnologists and European ethnologists on German ground, such as the organization's fifth biennial meeting (1998) jointly hosted by the Institut für Historische Ethnologie and the Institut für Europäische Ethnologie und Kulturanthropologie at the University of Frankfurt am Main. This conference proved to be an important site for the different disciplines (in Germany and internationally) to engage one another on the definition of "fieldwork," a practice that all ethnologists undertake, but which hold different meanings for the different intellectual lineages. The results of one workshop, on "The Politics of Anthropology at Home," ultimately was published as a special issue, not of EASA's journal, *Social Anthropology*, but of the Frankfurt-based *Anthropological Journal on European Cultures*.[691]

Between the German ethnological traditions' and these international organizations' understandings of "European ethnology," we can observe two kinds of mirroring—one discursive, one structural. First, just as *Volkskunde* came to see itself as a field characterized by unity in diversity, so SIEF's and EASA's founding identity narratives cast the history of Europe's anthropologies within the same political slogan.[692]

(HU-Berlin), and current editorial board members include Gisela Welz (Frankfurt am Main) and Bernhard Tschofen (Tübingen).

691 Ina-Maria Greverus, Christian Giordano, and Regina Römhild, eds., *The Politics of Anthropology at Home. Fifth Biennial Conference of the European Association of Social Anthropologists, Frankfurt am Main, 1998*, Anthropological Journal on European Cultures 8.1 (Hamburg: LIT, 1999); Ina-Maria Greverus, Christian Giordano, and Regina Römhild, eds., *The Politics of Anthropology at Home. Fifth Biennial Conference of the European Association of Social Anthropologists, Frankfurt am Main, 1998*, Anthropological Journal on European Cultures 8.2 (Münster: LIT, 2000).

692 Schippers, "A History of Paradoxes: Anthropologies of Europe," 234.

Second, that SIEF and EASA split European ethnology between a historical rooting either in folklore studies (SIEF) or in social/cultural anthropology (EASA) in a way mirrors how Europe as a research field has become split between Germany's *Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie* and *Ethnologie*.[693] Viewed within these comparisons, the German field does not seem as untranslatable or uncooperative as some might posit.

This mirroring might tempt one to accept the Germany's split ethnologies as simply the continuation of a historical, even natural intellectual tradition of parsing of anthropological knowledge pursuits. Yet, to some, the persistent separation of the two fields is a genuine problem revealing a serious lack of disciplinary reflexivity. Especially for my interviewees who have a foot in each world, it is becoming less and less meaningful to maintain a disciplinary boundary between fields that today more than ever before share a number of methodological and theoretical commonalities, as well as (at least for some researchers and institutes) a view of culture in the context of globalization whereby fieldwork is "multi-sited" even when a researcher places herself in a single-sited design. Or, if two discrete fields must be maintained, would it not be more logical, given the nature of the internal diversity of *Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie,* to shift the formal boundary from between *Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie* and *Ethnologie* to between *Volkskunde* and *Ethnologie*, of which Europe would be a regional specialization?

During her tenure on the EASA executive board, Dorle Dracklé penned a condensed account of the historical and political reasons for the ongoing separation of Germany's cultural anthropologies. Like so many of the boundary debates discussed in Part III, Dracklé begins by noting how the fields' descriptors—*Ethnologie*, *Völkerkunde*,

[693] Compare Welz, "Europa: Ein Kontinent—Zwei Ethnologien."

Ethnographie, and *Volkskunde*—were used interchangeably until two lines of specialization coalesced in the nineteenth century: one philologically and nationally oriented (*Volkskunde*), the other ethnological and focused on non-European peoples (*Völkerkunde*). She then reprises briefly the politically precipitated splintering of *Volkskunde* in the 1960s/70s, the emergence of a model of *Europäische Ethnologie* out of *Volkskunde*, and its convergence with *Ethnologie* on the study of culture in Europe.[694]

Dracklé summarizes the status of interdisciplinary relations at the time she was writing, stating, "Today, while most representatives of the respective faculties would prefer to maintain their separateness, a clear-cut trend in a number of institutes is discernible in favour of greater convergence." However, she declares, "Until real agreement among the opposing camps, together with a genuine anthropology of Europe, is able to emerge (which should also bring about an end to the colonizing distance between 'them and us'), and so long as there remains a refusal to reflect upon one's own personal involvement in anthropology and on oneself *per se*, the divide between *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* will remain in place."[695] Just as Regina Bendix insisted to SIEF members that same year that reflexivity about disciplinarity must be exercised for a European ethnology to find an identity,[696] so Dracklé argues that a similar reflexive enterprise is necessary if Germany's anthropologies are to successfully collaborate.

In this framing of the boundary issue, a full merger does not, as ever, appear to be on the table, for practical and political purposes. Still, that Dracklé herself advocates disciplinary rapprochement is evidenced by her leadership of one of the few university institutes that deliberately blends the two: the Institut für Ethnologie und

---

694 Dracklé, "Farewell to Humboldt? Teaching and Learning Anthropology in Germany," 59–60.
695 Ibid., 60.
696 Bendix, "Translating Between European Ethnologies," 377.

Kulturwissenschaft at the Universität Bremen, which she directed from 2004–2014.[697] Though founded just over ten years ago to house the new B.A. program in *Kulturwissenschaft* and the M.A. program in *Transkulturelle Studien* (transcultural studies), the institute's paradigm-breaking form reflects the historical identity of the University: a "reform" university established amid the West German antiauthoritarian revolution with the aim of upending the traditional structure of German higher education.[698] That Bremen could successfully institute *Ethnologie* as an umbrella title capturing both of Germany's anthropological traditions is nothing short of revolutionary, given the fields' persisting mutual boundary anxieties.

Though not structurally joining the two fields under one disciplinary roof, the department (Professur) of Vergleichende Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie at the Europa Universität Viadrina (founded 1991) in Frankfurt an der Oder does not make a formal distinction between studying foreign cultures and one's own—an institutional profile they emphasize by deliberately using the name "Anthropologie" (translating the English term "anthropology") instead of "Ethnologie" (which indexes the German non-Europeanist tradition).[699] The chair, Werner Schiffauer, is a publicly engaged expert on migration,

---

[697] When the University of Bremen was founded in 1971, it was organized without formal departments. A degree program (*Studiengang*) in *Kulturwissenschaft* was added in 1986/87. The Institut für Kulturwissenschaft was then founded in 2004, and renamed the Institut für Ethnologie und Kulturwissenschaft in 2011. Michi Knecht, who completed her *Promotion* at the Tübingen Institut für Empirische Kulturwissenschaft and her *Habilitation* at the Institut für Europäische Ethnologie at the HU-Berlin, joined the Bremen faculty as director in 2014. As Dorle Dracklé emphasized in our conversations, theirs is the only university department in Germany that formally blends the two *Ethnologien*.

[698] A recently published history of the University of Bremen presents the institution as a hotbed of liberalism, a "Reform-Universität" where students and faculty alike engaged in the "Kampf gegen die Ordinarien-Universität"—the old model of German university hierarchy. Not surprisingly, this institutional instantiation of antiauthoritarian reform drew critical attention from conservative politicians (especially CDU members). Meier-Hüsing, *Universität Bremen 40 Jahre in Bewegung*, 50–85. For more on the university-wide project to document its history, see also http://www.uni-bremen.de/universitaet/profil/geschichte.html#c24051.

[699] Europa-Universität Viadrina Frankfurt (Oder), "Professur für Vergleichende Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie," *Europa-Universität Viadrina Frankfurt (Oder)*, accessed February 24, 2015, http://www.kuwi.europa-uni.de/de/lehrstuhl/vs/anthro/index.html.

Islamic culture, and intercultural contact and conflict in Germany and Europe.[700] Schiffauer undertook doctoral work in both fields: with a *Promotion* in *Ethnologie* at the Freie Universität Berlin, and a *Habilitation* in *Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie* in Frankfurt am Main. His colleague, Barbara Wolbert, who is trained in *Ethnologie*, but not *Europäische Ethnologie* or *Volkskunde*, likewise works on issues of migration and identity politics, with fieldwork in Germany, Turkey, Ghana, Kenya, and the U.S. As was the case in Bremen, the relative newness of the Europa-Universität Viadrina opened a space in which to imagine and instantiate an alternative to the traditional bipartite disciplinary paradigm.

The anthropology programs at Bremen and Viadrina are exceptional in their mindful revisions of disciplinary identity that emphasize common ethnological practices and analytical orientations over historical identities based on diverging regional objects that are no longer so divergent. They are exceptional in that they are rare and revolutionary. But, as we witnessed in Part II of the present work, the idea that *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* could converge as one ethnological or ethnographic discipline is not entirely new; it was practiced and advocated in the GDR by figures like

[700] Schiffauer has served, for instance, as head of the German Council for Migration (Rat für Migration), which he represents for providing research-based commentary on current issues concerning intercultural contact and conflict in Germany. Schiffauer's scholarly publications include Werner Schiffauer, *Kulturelle Charakteristika als Bedingungen intellektueller Kommunikation: Die türkische Minderheit* (Weinheim: Beltz, 1986); Werner Schiffauer, *Staat—Schule—Ethnizität: Politische Sozialisation von Immigrantenkindern in vier europäischen Ländern* (Münster: Waxmann, 2002); Werner Schiffauer, *Migration und kulturelle Differenz: Studie für das Büro der Ausländerbeauftragten des Senats von Berlin* (Berlin: Die Ausländerbeauftrage des Senats, 2002); Werner Schiffauer, *Parallelgesellschaften: Wie viel Wertekonsens braucht unsere Gesellschaft?: Für eine kluge Politik der Differenz* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2008); Werner Schiffauer, *Nach dem Islamismus: Eine Ethnographie der Islamischen Gemeinschaft Milli Görüs* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2010); Werner Schiffauer, *Die Gottesmänner: Türkische Islamisten in Deutschland. Eine Studie zur Herstellung religiöser Evidenz* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2000); Werner Schiffauer, *Die Gewalt der Ehre: Erklärungen zu einem deutsch-türkischen Sexualkonflikt* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1983); Werner Schiffauer, *Islamism in the Diaspora: The Fascination of Political Islam among Second Generation German Turks* (Oxford: University of Oxford. Transnational Communities Programme, 1999).

Wolfgang Steinitz and Wolfgang Jacobeit. Furthermore, one cannot simply credit the impetus for such institutional transformations to revolutionary thinking. We have seen already how East German *Volkskunde*'s collusion with *Völkerkunde* was due in part to external pressure from the state to align with the Soviet model of *Ethnographie*. In twenty-first-century Germany, there are new state pressures, both national and supranational, that are pushing the fields toward each other, and in some cases forcing university departments to combine or realign themselves in ways that upend the traditional disciplinary models. This phenomenon will be discussed in detail in the third subsection of this chapter.

Finally, it should be noted that anxiety about the blurring of the traditional boundary between *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* is not concentrated solely on the side of the former. As Dieter Haller recently observed, there are "*Abgrenzungsimpulsen*" (impulses to demarcate) on the side of *Ethnologie* departments, as well, since *Europäische Ethnologie* emerged more forcefully since the 1990s as a competing *Ethnologie* that has become loosed of its roots in *Volkskunde* (understood as folklore studies).[701] As Dracklé also has noted, even the main professional organization has opted to retain its original title, *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Völkerkunde*, despite the field's universal renaming as *Ethnologie*, in that way maintaining a clear, historicizing parallelism with the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde*. The organizations have even agreed upon a way of distinguishing their acronyms: the former abbreviating itself as DGV, the latter as dgv.[702] Haller sees as part of this boundary impulse on the side of

---

[701] Haller, *Die Suche nach dem Fremden*, 331.

[702] Dracklé, "Farewell to Humboldt? Teaching and Learning Anthropology in Germany," 67n5. See also Bendix, "From 'Volkskunde' to the 'Field of Many Names,'" 384n19. The organization's publishing journal was called the *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* since its founding by Adolf Bastian and Robert Hartmann in 1869—a piece of historical evidence supporting *Völkerkunde*'s claiming of the term as its disciplinary title after World War II. See http://www.zeitschrift-fuer-ethnologie.de/.

Ethnologie an even greater resistance to accepting Germany and Europe as legitimate research sites for that field.[703] As a result, those who venture across the boundary, from *Ethnologie* into *Europäische Ethnologie*, can be marginalized by both, making it difficult to secure a professional position in either field.

For *Ethnologen* who study Europe or *Europäische Ethnologen* who examine transnational cultural phenomena, the continuing division between *Europäische Ethnologie* and *Ethnologie* no longer seems sensible. Indeed, ongoing arguments for their division even appear to some to be simply an "*Ausrede*" (excuse) that comes down to a banal question of status and resource competition. Between the separatist and collaborative perspectives lies a middle ground of disciplinary practice at the level of individual researchers, projects, and institutions. But, as alluded to above, the will to collaborate across the boundaries, reorganize the boundaries, or even abolish them is increasing the result of new or previous, but amplifying, outside pressures—both disciplinary and political. These pressures will be the topics of the next section.

EXTERNAL PRESSURES

As we have seen across Parts I, II, and III thus far, international connections took varying forms, with shifting significances for Germany's *Volkskunde* across the postwar period. Reintegration in the international anthropological and folklore community in Europe and across the Atlantic morphed from a defensive assertion of continuity with the less implicated Germanic traditions, to resuming dialogue about—though not immediate action for—integrating the continent's anthropologies. Both of these trends, it has been shown, resonated with broader public discourses and political strategies to rehabilitate

[703] Haller, *Die Suche nach dem Fremden*, 331.

and reintegrate Germany in a new world order. The Cold War represented a new form of international connection—and disconnection—as factions of Germany's *Volkskunde* on both sides of the Wall sought to communicate despite political obstructions. At the same time, the field was transforming into a discipline of diverging identities, the contours of which were informed by different lines of international disciplinary influence. This section will focus on developments since the 1990s in European and trans-Atlantic connections, in particular two interweaving pressures on the field: 1) the tensions that arise in a situation where integrating in the "global" anthropological community typically means acquiescing to the standards of the hegemonic Anglophone traditions, and 2) the structural implications of reorganization efforts in European and German higher education and research funding.

As discussed with reference to the 1982 Berlin meeting, one of the sites of resonance between Germany's *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* and *Ethnologie* as they converged on Europe was a shared turn toward reflexivity in ethnographic research. The "crisis of representation" and "reflexive turn" are associated especially with the Anglophone traditions, as British social anthropology and American cultural anthropology began to critically consider the ethical implications of a tradition of ethnographic fieldwork and writing that placed researchers and their interlocutors in an unequal power relation.[704] But, in a translation of the *Sonderweg* trope that appears like

[704] The crisis of ethnographic representation has its roots in the 1960s, but the best known articulations of the problem and possible solutions to it are two 1986 publications: *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*, by George Marcus and Michael Fischer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), and *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, edited by James Clifford and George Marcus (Berkeley: University of California Press). "Writing culture" encompassed an evaluation of anthropology's past and future possibilities in terms of the politics and poetics of ethnography. By confronting the power inequality inherent in both ethnographic fieldwork and writing, and recognizing ethnographic truths as "inherently partial—committed and incomplete" (James Clifford, Introduction to *Writing Culture*, 7 and passim) this response to the ongoing "crisis of representation" opened new possibilities for ethnography: for the study of an anthropologist's own culture; for experimental research design that upends the tradition of stationary fieldwork; and for new modes of

an inversion, some German *Volkskundler* / *Europäische Ethnologen* have begun to point out that a reflexive turn occurred in their field simultaneously, if not earlier, beginning with the folklorism debate initiated by Hans Moser in the early 1960s. Yet, as Regina Bendix recently argued, the folklorism debate is a prime example of how "it is still far more likely that new theoretical trends are translated and germanified so as to amplify German intellectual discourse than for German contributions to reach an international audience."[705] When such a reference is made to an "international audience" or "global anthropology," it is typically understood to be an English-speaking audience, with the British and American traditions dominating.[706]

Not only is the *Sonderweg* trope being translated into the notion that Germany's *Volkskunde* was actually ahead of the curve in the "reflexive turn." The field's postwar turn away from theory and toward methodological innovation also finds a kind of translation in contemporary notions about German superiority in ethnographic research ethics and fieldwork methodology. For example, German-trained and Vienna-based

---

ethnographic representation that reveal the researcher's position and allow a multitude of other voices to speak. Ethnography's redemption as a research practice and literary genre was made possible by reimagining the ethnographer as a culturally situated, seeing and speaking subject. See also footnote 673 of the present work for exemplars of reflexive ethnography and German theorizing on the concept.

[705] Bendix, "From 'Volkskunde' to the 'Field of Many Names,'" 378.

[706] Bendix notes elsewhere that "there is a legacy produced by the larger or perhaps 'louder' ethnological research traditions, written in languages that are read transnationally. And there are 'smaller' ethnologies,' . . . which much like local culture in the face of globalization must articulate their intellectual locality *vis-à-vis* the more global aspirations of larger ethnologies." In the accompanying footnote, Bendix goes on to talk specifically about the "odd" relationship between European Ethnology and British and US-American anthropologies, stating that those traditions are unwilling to acknowledge "the deep historical relationships between their own colonial origins and European Ethnology's national origins"—a situation that, it is implied, exacerbates the imbalance of reception. Bendix, "Translating Between European Ethnologies," 371; 378n3.

Gisela Welz makes a similar argument when she describes how "European ethnologies today . . . constitute a minor academic tradition within the broader area of global anthropologies. The majority of their publications are not in English but in their respective countries' languages. As a consequence, they have less visibility than those of their colleagues who participate in English-language dominated, transnational discourse." Gisela Welz, "Ethnology," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, ed. James D. Wright, 2nd ed. (Amsterdam: Elsevier, forthcoming), 1–5.

Europäische Ethnologin Brigitta Schmidt-Lauber, whose work in the field focuses mainly on methodology, recently observed in her contribution to the 2012 edited volume, *A Companion to Folklore*: "The practice of citing interview transcripts in German-speaking European ethnology appears to me to be more rigid than in Anglo-American scholarly practice, which may have something to do with a traditional consciousness in the discipline for language and texts as well as specific disciplinary ethics."[707]

Although embedded in a footnote to her essay, Schmidt-Lauber's implication that Germany's *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* is a tradition of higher ethical standards and greater methodological rigor than the Anglo-American traditions—that is, the internationally dominant Anglophone anthropologies—is poignant when read in conversation with Bendix's concern about the unbalanced reception of German *Volkskunde* scholarship in the international sphere. That Schmidt-Lauber's essay appears in an English-language, American-published work on diverse national and regional traditions of folklore studies further amplifies the poignancy. While it is not a direct criticism of Anglophone hegemony in the international anthropological community, when triangulated with comments like Bendix's[708] and the context of publication, it seems to speak to a certain ambivalence among *Volkskundler* / *Europäische Ethnologen* when it comes to reaching an international audience of anthropologists that transacts the discipline in English, is dominated by the Anglophone traditions, and as such does not as readily recognize the work done in the German-speaking sphere.

In 2006, Hermann Bausinger described international engagement as an increasingly important criterion of quality for research in the field. Yet even he expressed

---

[707] Schmidt-Lauber, "Seeing, Hearing, Feeling, Writing: Approaches and Methods from the Perspective of Ethnological Analysis of the Present," 574n8.

[708] See also footnotes 706 and 715 of the present work.

some hesitation about this development specifically with regard to the dominance of English in publishing. What is the point, he wonders, of publishing an article about a very specific element of German folk culture only in English? While his interlocutor in that published conversation, Wolfgang Kaschuba, agrees, he adds that when "*europäische*" got added to the field's identity, the Germans could no longer restrict themselves only to German-language publications.[709] But while Bausinger casts the path to English dominance of international scholarship as a slippery slope, he admits that a complete conversion of the field's knowledge dissemination to English—in the way the Scandinavian traditions have done—is not so likely, given the diversity of *Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie* in Germany. There are still journals, like the *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*, but also institutional or regional organs, that publish almost exclusively in German. And, as Bausinger himself notes, some topic areas are more likely to garner international interest than others. Germany's *Volkskunde* has progressed from an exclusively national focus in its origins to a research purview that is national, regional, European, and global, depending on the individual researcher, institute, or project—precisely the kind of "selling point" encapsulated in the claim of unity in diversity.

Echoing these published sentiments, by the conclusion of my fieldwork in 2010/11, the consensus among my interlocutors in the field was that Germany's *Europäische Ethnologie* still did not have a very significant international profile apart from certain institutes—Tübingen, Frankfurt am Main, and the Humboldt University in Berlin, for instance. However, as Gisela Welz recently informed me, the scene has changed already since then—specifically concerning the use of English in scholarship as a vehicle and indicator of international engagement.[710] In addition to the ever growing

[709] Bausinger, *Ein Aufklärer des Alltags*, 133.
[710] Gisela Welz to Amanda Randall, "Re: Dissertation Quote Request," February 22, 2015.

trend of individual scholars publishing articles and monographs in English, some institutes are beginning to publish or republish collections of their faculty members' and graduate students' writings in English for greater international circulation and reception.[711] Other institutes are involved in interdisciplinary research projects, the proceedings and results of which are frequently—and sometimes exclusively—published in English.[712] As in the example of the *AJEC* 1998 special issue discussed in the previous section, panels and special sessions at international and/or English-language conferences are being published in English through German scholarly journals and book series.[713] And, there remains a well-established relationship between the German *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* community and the American *Journal of Folklore Research* (formerly the *Journal of the Folklore Institute* until 1983), which has published not only individual articles by German *Volkskundler* / *Europäische Ethnologen*, but special issues featuring research from the German sphere.[714]

---

[711] See, for instance, the collection of significant essays and lectures from the Tübingen Institut für Empirische Kulturwissenschaft, Monique Scheer et al., eds., *Out of the Tower: Essays on Culture and Everyday Life* (Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 2013).

[712] See, for instance, the interdisciplinary project, "The Constitution of Cultural Property," begun at the University of Göttingen in 2008 in cooperation with the University of Hamburg. *Europäische Ethnologen* Regina Bendix and Bernhard Tschofen among the current project directors, and numerous other professors and PhD students in the field have taken part. The project receives funding support from Germany's top federal granting agency, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. Visit the project homepage at http://cultural-property.uni-goettingen.de/research-unit/. The list of publications can be found at http://cultural-property.uni-goettingen.de/publications/.

[713] See, for instance, the edited volume that emerged from the 2011 SIEF conference (Lisbon), published as part of the Frankfurt Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie in-house series, "Kulturanthropologie Notizen": Ana Isabel Afonso and Gisela Welz, *Negotiating Environmental Conflicts: Local Communities, Global Policies*, Kulturanthropologie Notizen 81 (Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, 2012). Indeed, from its founding, the Frankfurt institute has been among the most active in pursuing international connections, within Europe and trans-Atlantic. See, for instance, the English-language *Anthropological Journal on European Cultures* cofounded by Ina-Maria Greverus. See also the edited volume, Regina F. Bendix and Gisela Welz, eds., *Kulturwissenschaft und Öffentlichkeit: Amerikanische und deutschsprachige Volkskunde im Dialog*, Kulturanthropologie Notizen 70 (Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, 2002).

[714] See, for instance, *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 5, no. 2/3 (1968); *Journal of Folklore Research* 36, no. 2/3 (1999); *Journal of Folklore Research* 47, no. 1 (2010).

Thus, while internationalism for *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* has meant, on the one hand, forming a European research identity for at least some corners of the field, it also has come to imply the ability to engage in the "global" anthropological community via scholarly competency in English.[715] With funding lacking for translating German ethnography into English, those who are not comfortable writing or presenting in the language are at a particular professional disadvantage. But for the generation of university students who began their studies in the 2000s, the regular use of English in courses of *Europäische Ethnologie* has become not only an internal initiative at some institutes, but a national and international initiative under the auspices of the so-called Bologna Process.[716]

The Bologna Process, administered by the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), is a Europe-wide initiative launched in 1999 with the ratification of the Bologna Declaration aimed at creating greater compatibility and coherence among Europe's systems of higher education within the succeeding ten years.[717] The Process works by replacing nationally diverse degree programs with comparable bachelor's and master's degrees and by instituting a common course hour credit and grade point average system. The scheme also intends to foster greater flexibility for students completing their degrees

---

[715] Compare also Reinhard Johler, "Ach Europa! Zur Zukunft der Volkskunde," in *Volkskunde '00: Hochschulreform und Fachidentität. Hochschultagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde*, ed. Hochschultagung and Gudrun M. König (Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 2001). That European ethnology struggles to attain international recognition is not a problem isolated to that cultural science, however. Dorle Dracklé, for instance, similarly discusses the linguistic barrier for the circulation of research for *Ethnologie* in Germany: Dracklé, "Farewell to Humboldt? Teaching and Learning Anthropology in Germany," 66–67. Similar discussions concerning the hegemony of Anglophone anthropology are occurring within other national or regional anthropologies, as well. See, for instance, Takami Kuwayama, *Native Anthropology: The Japanese Challenge to Western Academic Hegemony* (Rosanna, Australia: Trans Pacific, 2004).

[716] On twenty-first-century university restructuring as a field for ethnographic research, see the special issue of EASA's journal, *Social Anthropology* 18, no. 1 (2010): "Anthropologies of University Reform."

[717] "History," *Bologna Process—European Higher Education Area*, 2014, http://www.ehea.info/article-details.aspx?ArticleId=3.

in countries where they do not speak the local language fluently, for instance by allowing them to write theses and dissertations in English. *Volkskundler* and *Europäische Ethnologen* are already sensitive to the particular implications of the Bologna Process for their field. As Regina Bendix, for instance, has observed: "The structural effects of this political endeavor leave their mark particularly on small fields"—like *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie*—"that have to enter into cooperation with neighboring disciplines"—such as *Ethnologie*, religious studies, or archaeology—"so as to be able to offer degree programs at all."[718]

Thus, while institutes at Bremen or the Viadrina University deliberately constructed programs that blur the boundaries between *Europäische Ethnologie* and *Ethnologie*, under the Bologna Process, other institutes are dealing with restructuring initiatives handed down by university administrations. For example, *Kulturanthropologie / Volkskunde* at the Johannes Gutenberg Universität Mainz, formally part of the division of German philology, was reorganized under the Institut für Film-, Theater- und Empirische Kulturwissenschaft.[719] The Seminar für Volkskunde at the Universität Bonn, meanwhile, was reorganized as the Abteilung (department) der Kulturanthropologie / Volkskunde under the Institut für Archäologie und Kulturanthropologie, with a degree program encompassing both Europeanist and non-Europeanist *Ethnologien*.

The economic crisis of 2008 only exacerbated the pressure to reform, as utilitarianism in higher education became more highly valued and institutional- and

---

[718] Bendix, "From 'Volkskunde' to the 'Field of Many Names,'" 381. Discussions of university reform in terms of its unequal effects for smaller disciplines like *Volkskunde* were also took place at a series of university conference of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde through the 1990s and 2000s. See, in particular, Korff and König, *Volkskunde '00*.

[719] Departments of *Ethnologie* are being affected by university restructuring as well. For example, the Institut für Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie at the University of Marburg was recently reorganized together with religious studies as the Institut für Vergleichende Kulturforschung—Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie und Religionswissenschaft.

national-level funding became scarcer. Interviewees often expressed a mixture of anxiety and resignation, mainly in response to the heavy bureaucratic demands for departmental self-assessment and internal curricular reform and to the increasing need to seek out research funding beyond the university (so-called "Drittmittel" or third-source support). Still, despite the universal structural changes, the prospect of being forced to reorganize institutionally in partnership with a neighboring field seemed to be a less immediate threat for most institutes.

In addition to these new supranational pressures on the organizational structures of German academia, there are also new national pressures on *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* in the form of federal research funding reform. The Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation), Germany's largest, most prestigious public funding body, had since 1920 categorized *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* along the lines of their nineteenth-century identities: *Volkskunde* competed with German and European literature and linguistics for funding, while *Völkerkunde* was grouped with non-European linguistics and regional cultural studies. In 2007, however, the group *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* was reassigned to the same category as *Ethnologie*. Both disciplines were by that point already accustomed to describing their research methods and theoretical positions in such a way that would convince nonanthropologist adjudicators to vote for their project proposals. With the reorganization, the concern became that Europeanists from both disciplines would be competing in a category in which 80% of the proposals and adjudicators focus outside Europe. However, a search of currently funded projects reveals that half of the German university institutes of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* are currently hosting research projects receiving

DFG funding for initiatives falling under a variety of categories, including individual projects, scholarly network-building, digitalization, publishing, and electronic research.[720]

That interdisciplinary and international collaborations are more likely to attract funding is an added impetus for the field to tread across its external disciplinary boundaries.[721] With the structural reorganizations taking place at the levels of university departments and national research funding, one can expect that new epistemic structures for the field might be emerging as well. Regina Bendix believes this is the case concerning the Bologna Process. Though the full implications of those structural reforms are not yet known, Bendix speculates that the completed and possible restructurings of university degree programs to encompass formerly separate fields could ultimately yield new, innovative lines of research.[722] One could say the same about the greater interdisciplinary and international interactions in research encouraged by the DFG reforms, as well.

But then, Bendix wonders, "How come that in such a time of transformation members of the discipline do not at least make an effort to overcome the surely unique state of practicing a field of many names?"[723] She answers her own question, stating that ". . . attending to the micro-climate of every institution within which the field is taught

---

720 Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, "GEPRIS: Geförderte Projekte der DFG," *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*, accessed February 24, 2015, http://gepris.dfg.de/gepris/OCTOPUS?task =showSearchSimple.

721 For example, researchers at the Göttingen Institut für Kulturanthropologie / Europäische Ethnology are collaborating on an interdisciplinary project, "Cultural Property," mentioned previously. The Institut für Europäische Ethnologie at the Humboldt University is involved in an international graduate program with the research focus, "Die Welt in der Stadt: Metropolitanität und Globalisierung vom 19. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart." Visit the program's homepage at http://www.kwhistu.tu-berlin.de/fachgebiet_neuere_ geschichte/menue/dfg_graduate_research_program_2012-2016/. One also ought to note that the DFG is now accepting grant applications in English—further evidence of Germany's interest in integrating in the international scientific community, as well as of the language's permeation as the international lingua franca of science, even at the level of Europe's national science funding bodies.

722 Bendix, "From 'Volkskunde' to the 'Field of Many Names,'" 381.

723 Ibid.

and practiced is apparently considered more important than having one shared name."[724] The implication of prioritizing institutional over disciplinary organization may thus be that the Bologna Process's external pressure is revealing to what extent the field's structures are still fragile. If Germany's *Volkskundler* / *Europäische Ethnologen* took the top-down restructuring procedures as an occasion to practice greater self-reflexivity, perhaps they could finally come to a consensus on a unified identity beyond the improvised "unity in diversity." Or, viewed a different way, perhaps it will be under these new extradisciplinary pressures that the "unity in diversity" narrative finally breaks down or undergoes a new translation. To conclude, the final section of this chapter examines emerging disciplinary identity discourses, and how a presentist trope of boundary construction and traversal is indeed emerging to overshadow the backwards-looking trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* that had dominated institutional memory up to the end of the twentieth century.

THE BOUNDARY TROPE IN EMERGING DISCIPLINARY NARRATIVES

Regina Bendix summarizes well the contours of German *Volkskunde*'s present "unity in diversity":

> One might also ask what, in this profusion of minor and major differences in the name signals a common academic discipline. A joint history, rich in debate not least about the contours and the name of the discipline, evidence that the precursors of these institutes once were named *Volkskunde*, and being listed on the homepage of the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde* (German *Volkskunde* Society) as places offering training in the field are the strongest markets of a disciplinarity that is, however, porous and historically built on interdisciplinary foundations.[725]

[724] Ibid.
[725] Ibid., 365.

Yet this description posits a field that is still very much inward- and backward-looking, focused on shared roots, not present practices and identities that bring the no-longer-so insular institutes together or push them apart. If what Wolf Lepenies and Peter Weingart have observed is true—that "when the establishment of new research areas and pleas for institutional support are at stake, retroactively constructed histories of the continuous and cumulative development of such fields are a typical form [of self-legitimation]"[726]—then one might expect in an age of bureaucratic organizational and funding restructuring that new framings of *Volkskunde*'s history would emerge to meet the expectations of current administrative bodies in order to defend its status as a legitimate, valuable scientific field. This section examines some hints of the features of that new narrative.

If one browses the institute profile pages of Germany's twenty-six university institutes of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie*, one find that while institutional names diverge, the self-descriptions typically carry all or most of the key words included in other institute names. The Seminar für Europäische Ethnologie / Volkskunde at the University of Kiel, for instance, describes its disciplinary identity thus:

> Europäische Ethnologie / Volkskunde versteht sich als empirisch arbeitende Kulturwissenschaft, die ihren Fokus auf die Alltagskultur vorzugsweise in Deutschland, aber mit vergleichender Perspektive auf Europa legt. . . . Dabei arbeitet die Europäische Ethnologie / Volkskunde sowohl historisch als auch gegenwartsbezogen, indem sie Kultur als sozial bedingt und geschichtlich geprägt versteht und zugleich ihre wesentliche auf die Gesellschaft zurückwirkende Bedeutung betont. Charakteristisch ist ihre thematische, methodische und theoretische Breite, die sich in einer starken Interdisziplinarität widerspiegelt.[727]

---

[726] Lepenies and Weingart, "Introduction," xvi.

[727] "*Europäische Ethnologie* / *Volkskunde* is understood as an empirically operating cultural discipline whose focus is on everyday culture, primarily in Germany but with a comparative perspective for Europe . . . in this way Europäische Ethnologie/Volkskunde works both historically and with concern for the present, whereby it understands culture as socially conditioned and historically influenced, thereby emphasizing culture's essential, socially influential meaning. Characteristic [of the field] is its thematic, methodological,

The profile goes on to explain how, although at some German universities the field is called "Kulturanthropologie (Göttingen, Frankfurt/M., Mainz)" or "Empirische Kulturwissenschaften (Tübingen)," this is not a matter of differing disciplines, but rather of institute-specific disciplinary names.[728] The concluding paragraph then explains how the field came to be institutionalized at that university, beginning with the nineteenth-century history of *Volkskunde*.

The Kiel Seminar, and the field its faculty members practice and teach today, sees itself as an empirical, interdisciplinary, social, and cultural science; focused on everyday life in Germany and in European comparison, both historically and in the present; and sharing a genealogy with other institutes whose diversity of names does not represent different disciplines, but rather institute-specific identities within one discipline. At every turn, then, the institutional memory—the sum of the stories told and the structures they describe—of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* is today crisscrossed with references to boundaries. Absent from Kiel's story—and from most other institute web profiles—is the mid-twentieth-century rupture of the field's fascist entanglements. Though not forgotten, in the latest historiographies of the field, it is the trope of boundaries that tends to frame the identity narrative.

Europäische Ethnologen in Germany are increasingly involved in projects dedicated to documenting the work of contemporary European ethnology, anthropology of Europe, and folklore studies, claiming a transnational disciplinary identity by focusing on dynamic research content rather than historical distinctions between different national

---

and theoretical breadth, reflected in a strong interdisciplinarity." "Europäische Ethnologie / Volkskunde," *Seminar für Europäische Ethnologie / Volkskunde, Christian-Albrechts-Universitaet zu Kiel*, accessed February 25, 2015, http://www.europaeische-ethnologie-volkskunde.uni-kiel.de/de/profil. Many institute websites also offer an English-language version to present themselves to a broader, international audience, though Kiel does not happen to be one of them.

[728] Ibid.

approaches.[729] When German *Volkskunde*'s history is mentioned, then it is often a translation of the *Sonderweg* trope, tracing a line of progress from the field's nationalist foundations, its delegitimation under fascism, its reflexive resurrection in the 1960/70s, which then became the origin story for the history of the field's present self-narrative of *intra*disciplinary and *inter*disciplinary rigor and robustness. However, there are emerging now other narratives that situate *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* more securely as a part of an international field of European ethnology, and with that, as part of a longer history of social and cultural anthropology on the global scale.

In a forthcoming encyclopedia article, for instance, Gisela Welz posits ethnology as a precursor to cultural and social anthropology, beginning with Adolf Bastian and his student, Franz Boas, the German "father" of American anthropology. She then traces how ethnology was recast as one research specialization under the disciplinary umbrella term anthropology. Finally, in recounting how national ethnologies proliferated in Europe, Welz's treatment circles back to the German case, ending with the statement: "The rejection of the old Volkskunde designation signaled a theoretical paradigm shift as much as it did a political turning point, leaving behind the politically conservative, often at least latently nationalist research agenda."[730] However, her conclusion ultimately resituates Germany's *Europäische Ethnologie* within the European community, which she sees being overshadowed by the Anglophone anthropological traditions.

Yet Welz concludes with a redemptive, historicizing thought: "Anthropology, like any other scholarly discipline, is not a universal endeavor but a historically contingent

---

[729] See, for instance, German contributions to Ullrich Kockel, Mairead Nic Craith, and Jonas Frykman, eds., *A Companion to the Anthropology of Europe* (Hoboken: John Wiley, 2012); Regina F. Bendix and Galit Hasan-Rokem, eds., *A Companion to Folklore* (Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012). Compare also Johler, "Ach Europa! Zur Zukunft der Volkskunde"; Johler, "Doing European Ethnology in a Time of Change: The Metamorphosis of a Discipline (in Germany and Europe)"; Welz, "Ethnology."

[730] Welz, "Ethnology," 4.

project infused with hegemonic powers and national interests. It is also able to generate innovative energy and political critique."[731] As for the future of ethnology, although Welz does not foresee ethnology—a "Europe-derived academic project"—overtaking the Anglo-American hegemon, she welcomes the emerging counterbalance of new, postcolonial anthropologies in the global south.[732]

Though Welz's account rehearses some standard themes in the historiography of Germany's *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie*, it transgresses certain narrative boundaries by moving quickly past the traditional historical *mea culpa* to speak truth to power in a contemporary international disciplinary politics that positions Europe as the minor tradition. At the same time, the scholarly references upon which she builds her narrative include a strongly German presence, raising to greater visibility leading contributions from her own field.[733] Dieter Kramer's 2013 introductory volume, *Europäische Ethnologie und Kulturwissenschaften*,[734] similarly bypasses the standard account, save for a paragraph-long summary of how *Volkskunde* became a "*Vielnamenfach*." Instead, he focuses exclusively on descriptions of current trends in

[731] Ibid., 5.
[732] Ibid.
[733] Jean-Louis Georget, who is also interested in the boundary-crossing attempts and potential of Germany's *Volkskunde*, makes a similar observation about the implications of Helge Gerndt's *Kulturwissenschaft im Zeitalter der Globalisierung: Volkskundliche Markierungen* (Münster: Waxmann, 2002). Although Gerndt's book addresses multiple cultural studies fields, the work is especially reflective of the current state of research in German *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie*. Moreover, Georget argues, it reflects an attempt to enter into closer conversation with the Anglophone traditions that have completely ("vollkommen") ignored the German field to that point. In Georget's estimation, attempting to establish *Volkskunde* as an internationally comparative cultural research field will prove difficult, given the analytical categories the field had developed (or rather, stopped developing) for itself. In this regard, Georget concludes, the field's best hope lies in interdisciplinary perspectives. As he states: "Aber allein ein multiperspektivischer Ansatz im Sinne der *histoire croisée*, der auch grenzüberschreidende Verflechtungen der Kulturkreise in den Blick nimmt, und eine Neuzusammensetzung der Disziplinen kann ihr helfen, aus de Sackgasse auszubrechen, in der sie viel zu lange verrannt hat." Georget, "Welche Zukunftsaussichten hat die Volkskunde? Eine Wissenschaft zwischen deutscher Nostalgie und europäischer Offnung," 279.
[734] Kramer, *Europäische Ethnologie und Kulturwissenschaften*.

theory and method in order to situate *Europäische Ethnologie* as part of—as opposed to being a competitor with[735]—the *Kulturwissenschaften* (cultural studies).

Two critical essays by Reinhard Johler take the opposite tack—pointing very directly to German *Volkskunde*'s *Sonderweg* issue, both with respect to the uniquely German *Volks-*/*Völkerkunde* division and in terms of *Volkskunde*'s apparent isolation among world anthropologies through the postwar decades. Yet his conclusion is ultimately in line with Welz's and Kramer's: the future of *Volkskunde* must entail boundary-crossing. In 2001, Johler wrote that Germany's *Volkskunde* is still not very internationally integrated in terms of research and reception.[736] He called upon *Volkskundler* to respond to that reality by taking "Europeanization" not simply as a trendy new research field, but rather by taking seriously those formal, high-bureaucratic efforts to Europeanize academia and scholarly research as an opportunity to reform the field through rigorous international networking at the levels of research, teaching, and administration.[737] By 2012, Johler would speak of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* as still moving toward a common European future in step with broader transnational cultural processes—one that could involve a new, structure-altering reflexivity, though not regarding the field's national past. Rather, a shared, transnational reflexivity regarding the notions of "Europe" and "Europeanization" that might open a "new *Sonderweg*—'*Sonderweg*' of European Ethnology."[738]

In all three cases, the authors are framing their field in new international and interdisciplinary contexts, and so provide new footing for an institutional memory not

---

[735] On earlier tension between *Europäische Ethnologie* and cultural studies, see Kaschuba, "Kulturalismus: Vom Verschwinden des Sozialen im gesellschaftlichen Diskurs."
[736] Johler, "Ach Europa! Zur Zukunft der Volkskunde," 170.
[737] Ibid., 173–179.
[738] Johler, "Doing European Ethnology in a Time of Change: The Metamorphosis of a Discipline (in Germany and Europe)," 247–251.

tied to national ruptures past. In addition to such introductory and programmatic texts, the trope of boundary-crossing can be recognized in new biographies and autobiographies of those figures who led the field's transformation in the 1960s/70s. Hermann Bausinger, for instance, has a chapter dedicated to the theme of "Grenzüberschreitung."[739] In another recent semibiographical work, entitled "Walking on Borderlines, Crossing Frontiers: Reflections on the Journeys of a Grenzgänger Journal," Ina-Maria Greverus recounts how the English-language *Anthropological Journal on European Cultures* that she cofounded in 1990 "was and remains an attempt to transcend boundaries, to liberate us cultural and social anthropologists form the shackles of a disciplinary division that developed historically and is particularly sustained at present."[740] That is, the journal aims to bring together research about the cultural complexity in Europe, to provoke interdisciplinary discussion among anthropologists in and of Europe, and to reflexively bridge anthropological theory and ethnographic practice.[741] And, as was discussed in Chapter 5, leading *Volkskundler* in the GDR are now, post-*Wende*, being represented as *Grenzgänger*, though, in contrast to the West German biographies, one sometimes detects in former East German invocations of boundary-crossing a sense of defensiveness against accusations of ideological investment.[742] These poignant instances of leading figures' retrospective self-reference in terms of their role as innovative (even subversive) boundary-crossers evidences the current cachet that the trope of boundaries is assembling in the latest narrative translations of the field's past into its institutional memory.

---

[739] Bausinger, *Ein Aufklärer des Alltags*, 131–150.

[740] Ina-Maria Greverus, "Walking on Borderlines, Crossing Frontiers: Reflections on the Journeys of a Grenzgänger Journal," *Anthropological Journal on European Cultures* 21, no. 2 (2012): 9–19.

[741] From the back cover of the first issue, quoted in Ibid., 11.

[742] See, for instance, Leo, *Leben als Balance-Akt*; Jacobeit, *Von West nach Ost und zurück*; Weber-Kellermann, Becker, and Bimmer, *Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann*.

SUMMARY

We have seen across Part III how, in shoring up its boundaries—securing an independent status for its organizational and epistemic structures—against *Germanistik*, cultural history, sociology, *Ethnologie*, and cultural studies, *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* did not simply reconstruct a self-legitimating, autopoietic disciplinary history to demonstrate some kind of enduring continuity. Nor did it simply continue to link itself, historically and presently, with different, less ideologically burdened Germanic traditions of folklore studies. Anticipating the field's splintering reform around "1968," different branches began borrowing selectively from the theories and methods claimed as sovereign to the selfsame neighboring disciplines that threatened to encroach upon *Volkskunde*. This was the origin of the field of many names—names that emblemize not just a fraught disciplinary history, but a diversity of interdisciplinary ties that have ironically become the field's identity marker. Moreover, these ties were not always within the German scientific sphere, but often channeled other national traditions, in particular Anglo-American social and cultural anthropology.

With the rise of interdisciplinary and international disciplinary engagement, accelerating demographic and technological shifts producing new cultural phenomena that remap the site of fieldwork, and national and supranational political and bureaucratic pressures, we witness in the twenty-first century the formation of a new institutional memory for Germany's *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* that relies not on the trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, but on the recovery of a latent trope of boundary erection and transgression. As the geopolitical order and scientific community in which the field is situated become further "Europeanized" and globalized, ever new stories of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie*'s identity and purpose will be required in order to sustain a legitimate existence. Whether that existence will continue in the precarious form of a

field held together by scraps of history, or whether it will entail some kind of dissolution or formal division into like branches remains to be seen. Perhaps, though, with the awakening of the boundary trope, we are beginning to see the contours of the structural reorganization to come.

Coda

As this project has demonstrated, Germany's *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* is a discipline obsessed with its past. In Part I of this study, we witnessed and unpacked the paradigmatic translations of the field's post–World War II institutional memory along the trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*. In conversation with public discourses concerning Germany's National Socialist past, the field's discursive identity performances at first translated its prewar history as part of a desperate and ironic rescue mission after *Volkskunde* had been legitimated by an illegitimate, fascist regime. Narratively exorcising the field's National Socialist entanglements finally affected a structural transformation that made the 1960s/70s the new starting point for a history of *Volkskunde*'s present as an ever increasingly internationalized and proudly interdisciplinary variation of a German "normal science." But, as Parts II and III attempted to show, translating the discipline solely via the trope of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, though it seemed the only option for a field sincerely trying to recover a legitimate, independent identity, left gaps in institutional memory that might now be recovered by recognizing a trope of boundary-maintenance and -crossing that is both latent and emerging.

In tracing boundary tropes in German *Volkskunde*'s institutional memory, we witness how the field cannot be imagined as evolving along some linear, isolated path of progress, as some classic models of history of science propose. Rather, this field is an exemplary case of how scientific fields form and reform themselves in conversation with other social fields. This case study goes further to explicate a heretofore largely unexplored dimension of scientific systems: how the translation of public discourse into disciplinary self-narratives has implications for the epistemic and organizational structuring of a discipline, as more than a Bachelardian epistemic obstacle.

But such a symbiosis, too, does not allow the translation to follow a regular, unidirectional flow, as we witnessed in Part II. The institutional memory—both the stories and the structures—of East German *Volkskunde* was, like East German society itself, circumscribed by official state ideologies. In consequence, institutional memory was often a repetition of state (and public) discourse. But as initial post-*Wende* institutional amnesia regarding GDR *Volkskunde* began lifting in the last ten years, we witness how multiple generations are now working to recover and stabilize the field's history apart from the official narratives, but also in the absence of that field's structures, as part of a reunified institutional memory. Public discourses and institutional identities must, in consequence, be treated as exerting reciprocal force.

When one probes the contours of present structures and identity discourses of Germany's *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie*, it becomes clear that the fraught relationship between science and the state—thematized in Parts I and II—is actually one of several salient boundaries that have impacted this discipline, as they might other ones. As disciplinary identity shifts orientation from past / national to present / international, we have seen how certain moments in institutional memory were recovered and/or reframed, raising other boundary concerns to the surface. But while this tropic shift is on

the one hand a sign of "normalization"—if one chooses to read it from within the frame of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*—it is hardly benign, for the hegemonies entailed in interdisciplinary and international disciplinary relations remain a preoccupation for the field when defining itself in historiographic narrative and disciplinary practice. The discipline, that is, may not be "normalized" or even able to normalize in the Kuhnian sense.

As stated in the Introduction, exploratory fieldwork for this project began with a question about translation and knowledge flows. What emerged in the course of the interview conversations was insight into how narratives and structures interact in a specialist field interacting with other social fields. This study considered a substantial body of historiography, but does not claim itself as a substantive contribution to the history of science—the point, after all, is not there is a lack of historiography, but rather a need to examine the implications of its abundance.

What this study ultimately does contribute is thus more directed at a methodological problem, offering a model for doing subcultural history of postwar Germany (and perhaps in other disciplines that are in states of imposed re-formation). For, to observe the emergence of the boundary trope in *Volkskunde*'s institutional memory is in many ways parallel to observing the boundary issues that German society has confronted since the end of World War II, beginning with a forced reconfiguring of its sense of identity from an isolated pariah state, to one divided and integrated into opposing power blocs, to a leader of post–Cold War Europe, and, in consequence, of the present world order.

Through all these institutional re-formations, the public discourses of Germany also have changed, which puts other pressures on the re-forming discipline. Flows of people into, out of, and through German territory—from displaced persons in the

aftermath of war, to foreign guest workers building a German *Wirtschaftswunder* and then a German home for themselves, to the fall of Communism in Europe and the rise of the European Union—have, at every turn, been taken up as research problems in *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie*. Hence, this German field's postwar integration in a European and global anthropological community was not simply a strategic move, but an organic development tied closely to demographic and cultural shifts in the traditional site of research. In other words, by its nature, *Volkskunde*'s problem is Germany's problem.

In this regard, despite lingering anxieties about legitimacy and relevance in the face of new boundary pressures, and despite persistent internal divisions that are often only exacerbated by those outside pressures, *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* still proposes to teach its own society something about itself. Indeed, a consistent concern for the field's *Aufgaben* means that the boundary between *Volkskunde* and the public must be not only kept in view, but regularly crossed through professional engagement in museums, media, politics, and business—that is, in any sphere in which questions of culture arise that could benefit from the expert knowledge that this scientific community can provide. As Wolfgang Kaschuba concludes in his introduction to the field:

> In this respect, *Europäische Ethnologie* shall and should also describe a practice-based European horizon of ethnological work. It can accomplish this with the demand—and the self-awareness—to accompany, observe, and comment with critical sympathy on the cultural and political developments in our contemporary society. Ethnology and anthropology clearly have something to "say" to us.[743]

[743]"Europäische Ethnologie will und soll insofern auch einen praxisbezogenen europäischen Horizont ethnologischen Arbeitens beschreiben. Sie kann dies mit dem Anspruch und in dem Selbstbewußtsein tun, die kulturellen wie politischen Entwicklungen in unseren Gegenwartsgesellschaften mit kritischer Sympathie zu begleiten, zu beobachten, und zu kommentieren. Ethnologie und Anthropologie haben uns offensichtlich etwas 'zu sagen.'" Kaschuba, *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*, 111.

As the discipline's epistemic and organizational structures continue to transform in conversation with developments in other social fields—national and international, specialist and lay—so, too, will new performances of disciplinary identity be required. Indeed, we are already seeing how the field's history is being translated to suggest an emerging trope of boundaries. This is the dynamic of institutional memory, for *Volkskunde* as for any scientific community.

*****

In the Introduction to this work, I describe my vision for this project as a methodological exercise in critical historiography meant to provoke greater reflexivity in the history of German science and society. Yet, as this study has demonstrated, reflexivity *within* the field of *Volkskunde* / *Europäische Ethnologie* hardly requires provocation. Critical reflection on *Volkskunde*'s history—its past epistemic and organizational structures and the origins of the present ones—has by now become standard practice within the field, including reflexivity concerning the implications of the historiography itself. What this study humbly hopes to offer, then, is a complement to that already rigorous practice, namely, the perspective of an outsider—or better, of a national and disciplinary *Grenzgängerin*. I thank my interlocutors, again, for so generously sharing their time and knowledge as I embarked on this project. I look forward to continuing the conversation.

Bibliography

Adelson, Leslie A., ed. *The Cultural After-Life of East Germany: New Transnational Perspectives*. Helen & Harry Gray Humanities Program Series. Washington, D.C.: American Institute for Contemporary German Studies, 2002.

Adorno, Theodor W. "Was bedeutet: Aufarbeitung der Vergangenheit?" In *Gesammelte Schriften: Kulturkritik und Gesellschaft*, Vol. 10.2, 555–572. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1977.

Afonso, Ana Isabel, and Gisela Welz. *Negotiating Environmental Conflicts: Local Communities, Global Policies*. Kulturanthropologie Notizen 81. Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, 2012.

Agar, Michael. "Institutional Discourse." *Text* 5, no. 3 (1985): 147–168.

Akademiia nauk SSSR. *Soviet Studies in Ethnography*. Problems of the Contemporary World 72. Moscow: Social Sciences Today, USSR Academy of Sciences, 1978.

Albrecht, Clemens. *Die Intellektuelle Gründung der Bundesrepublik: Eine Wirkungsgeschichte der Frankfurter Schule*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 1999.

Albrecht, Richard. "Was ist der Unterschied zwischen Türken und Juden?" *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 78, no. 2 (1982): 220–229.

Alzheimer-Haller, Heidrun. *Frauen in der Volkskunde, in der empirischen Kulturwissenschaft, der Europäischen Ethnologie / Ethnographie und Kulturanthropologie in Deutschland*. Würzburg: Bayerische Blätter für Volkskunde, 1994.

Amlung, Ullrich. *Adolf Reichwein, 1898-1944: Ein Lebensbild des Reformpädagogen, Volkskundlers und Widerstandskämpfers*. Frankfurt am Main: Dipa-Verlag, 1999.

Anz, Thomas. *"Es geht nicht um Christa Wolf": Der Literaturstreit im vereinten Deutschland*. Munich: Edition Spangenberg, 1991.

Arnold-de Simine, Silke. *Mediating Memory in the Museum: Trauma, Empathy, Nostalgia*. Palgrave Macmillan Memory Studies. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

———. , ed. *Memory Traces: 1989 and the Question of German Cultural Identity*. Oxford: P. Lang, 2005.

Arnold-de Simine, Silke, and Susannah Radstone. "The GDR and the Memory Debate." In *Remembering and Rethinking the GDR: Multiple Perspectives and Plural Authenticities*, edited by Anna Saunders and Debbie Pinfold, 19–33. Palgrave Macmillan Memory Studies. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Ash, Mitchell G. "The Self-Presentation of a Discipline: History of Psychology in the United States Between Pedagogy and Scholarship." In *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*, edited by Loren R. Graham, Wolf Lepenies, and Peter Weingart, 143–190. Sociology of the Sciences 7. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1983.

———. "Verordnete Umbrüche—Konstruierte Kontinuitäten: Zur Entnazifizierung von Wissenschaftlern und Wissenschaften nach 1945." *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 43, no. 10 (1995): 903–923.

———. "Wissenschaft und Politik als Ressourcen für einander." In *Wissenchaften und Wissenschaftspolitik: Bestandsaufnahmen zu Formationen, Brüche und Kontinuitäten im Deutschland des 20. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Rüdiger vom Bruch and Brigitte Kaderas, 32–51. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2002.

Ash, Mitchell G., and Alfons Söllner, eds. *Forced Migration and Scientific Change: Emigre German-Speaking Scientists and Scholars after 1933*. Washington, D.C.: German Historical Institute and Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Ash, Mitchell G., and Jan Surman, eds. *The Nationalization of Scientific Knowledge in the Habsburg Empire, 1848–1918*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Assion, Peter. "'Was Mythos unseres Volkes ist': Zum Werden und Wirken des NS-Volkskundlers Eugen Fehrle." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 81, no. 2 (1985): 200–243.

Assmann, Aleida. *Erinnerungsräume: Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*. 3. Aufl. C.H. Beck Kulturwissenschaft. Munich: C.H. Beck, 2006.

Assmann, Aleida, and Ute Frevert. *Geschichtsvergessenheit—Geschichtsversessenheit: Vom Umgang mit deutschen Vergangenheiten nach 1945*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1999.

Assmann, Jan. *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*. Beck'sche Reihe. Munich: C.H. Beck, 2000.

Assmann, Jan, and Tonio Hölscher, eds. *Kultur und Gedächtnis*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1988.

Austin, J.L. *How to Do Things with Words*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Bach, Adolf. *Deutsche Volkskunde: Wege und Organisation, Probleme, System, Methoden, Ergebnisse und Aufgaben, Schrifttum*. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1960.

Bachelard, Gaston. *The Formation of the Scientific Mind: A Contribution to a Psychoanalysis of Objective Knowledge*. Translated by Mary McAllester Jones. Manchester: Clinamen, 2002.

Bachmann, Manfred. "Adolf Spamer: Ein Leben für die deutsche Volkskunde." In *Deutsche Volkskunst*, 25–27. Staatliche Kommission für Kunstangelegenheiten, 1952.

Bachmann-Medick, Doris. *Cultural Turns: Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften*. Reinbek: Rowohlt Taschenbuch, 2006.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Edited by Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Bal, Mieke. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. Translated by Christine van Boheemen. 3rd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

Bal, Mieke, Jonathan V. Crewe, and Leo Spitzer, eds. *Acts of Memory: Cultural Recall in the Present*. Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 1999.

Barth, Fredrik, André Gingrich, Sydel Silverman, and Robert Parkin. *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French, and American Anthropology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Bauerkämper, Arnd, Martin Sabrow, and Bernd Stöver, eds. *Doppelte Zeitgeschichte: Deutsch-deutsche Beziehungen 1945–1990*. Bonn: J.H.W. Dietz, 1998.

Bausinger, Hermann. *Ein Aufklärer des Alltags: Der Kulturwissenschaftler Hermann Bausinger im Gespräch mit Wolfgang Kaschuba, Gudrun M. König, Dieter Langewiesche und Bernhard Tschofen*. Vienna: Böhlau, 2006.

———. “Folklore Research at the University of Tübingen: On the Activities of the Ludwig-Uhland-Institut.” Translated by William Templer. *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 5, no. 2/3 (1968): 124–33.

———. “Folklorismus in Europa: Eine Umfrage.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 65, no. 1 (1969): 1–8.

———. “Kritik der Tradition: Anmerkungen zur Situation der Volkskunde.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 65 (1969): 232–250.

———. “More Flexibility.” *Journal of Folklore Research* 47, no. 1/2 (2010): 203–209.

———. , ed. *Populus revisus: Beiträge zur Erforschung der Gegenwart. Arbeitstagung des Ludwig-Uhland-Instituts (Tübingen, Univ.) Ende April 1966 mit dem Rahmenthema: “Das Volksleben unserer Zeit.”* Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1966.

———. “Ungleichzeitigkeiten: Von der Volkskunde zur empirischen Kulturwissenschaft.” In *Kultursoziologie—Symptom des Zeitgeistes*, edited by Helmuth Berking and Richard Faber, 267–85. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1989.

———. “Volksideologie und Volksforschung: Zur Nationalsozialistischen Volkskunde.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 61, no. 2 (1965): 177–204.

———. *Volkskultur in der technischen Welt*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2005. First published in 1961 by W. Kohlhammer.

———. *Volkskunde als empirische Kulturwissenschaft*. Stuttgart: Klett, 1987.

———. *Volkskunde: Von der Altertumsforschung zur Kulturanalyse*. Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1999. First published in 1971 by Carl Habel.

———. , ed. *Zur Geschichte von Volkskunde und Mundartforschung in Württemberg: Helmut Dölker zum 60. Geburtstag*. Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1964.

———. “Zur Spezifik volkskundlicher Arbeit.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 76 (1980): 1–21.

———. “Zur Theoriefeindlichkeit in der Volkskunde.” *Ethnologia Europaea* 2/3 (69 1968): 55–58.

Bausinger, Hermann, and Wolfgang Brückner, eds. *Kontinuität? Geschichtlichkeit und Dauer als volkskundliches Problem*. Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1969.

Bausinger, Hermann, Utz Jeggle, Gottfried Korff, and Martin Scharfe. *Grundzüge der Volkskunde*. 4th ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1999. First published in 1978 by Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Beinek, Justyna, and Piotr H. Kosicki, eds. *Re-Mapping Polish-German Historical Memory: Physical, Political, and Literary Spaces since World War II*. Bloomington, Ind.: Slavica, 2011.

Ben-Amos, Dan. "Toward a Definition of Folklore in Context." *The Journal of American Folklore* 84, no. 331 (1971): 3–15.

Ben-Amos, Dan, James R. Dow, and Hannjost Lixfeld. "Zu einer Definition der Folklore im Kontext." *Jahrbuch für Volksliedforschung* 26 (1981): 15–30.

Bendix, Regina F. "Folklorism: The Challenge of a Concept." *International Folklore Review* 6 (1988): 5–15.

———. "From 'Volkskunde' to the 'Field of Many Names': Folklore Studies in the German-Speaking Europe since 1945." In *A Companion to Folklore*, edited by Galit Hasan-Rokem and Regina F. Bendix, 364–90. Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

———. *In Search of Authenticity: The Formation of Folklore Studies*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1997.

———. "Translating Between European Ethnologies." In *Times, Places, Passages: Ethnological Approaches in the New Millennium*, edited by Attila Paládi-Kovács, 371–380. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 2004.

Bendix, Regina F., and Tatjana Eggeling, eds. *Namen und was sie bedeuten: Zur Namensdebatte im Fach Volkskunde*. Göttingen: Schmerse, 2004.

Bendix, Regina F., and Galit Hasan-Rokem, eds. *A Companion to Folklore*. Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

Bendix, Regina F., and Gisela Welz, eds. *Kulturwissenschaft und Öffentlichkeit: Amerikanische und deutschsprachige Volkskunde im Dialog*. Kulturanthropologie Notizen 70. Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, 2002.

Bennett, Brett M., and Joseph Morgan Hodge, eds. *Science and Empire Knowledge and Networks of Science across the British Empire, 1800–1970*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Bensaude-Vincent, Bernadette. "A Founder Myth in the History of Sciences?—The Lavoisier Case." In *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*, edited by Loren R. Graham, Wolf Lepenies, and Peter Weingart, 53–78. Sociology of the Sciences 7. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1983.

Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966.

Bernhardt, Hannelore, ed. *Geschichte der Völkerkunde und Volkskunde an der Berliner Universität: Zur Aufarbeitung des Wissenschaftserbes*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin 28. Berlin: Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, 1991.

Bertuzzo, Eliza, Eszter B. Gantner, Heike Oevermann, and Jörg Niewöhner, eds. *Kontrolle öffentlicher Räume: Unterstützen, Unterdrücken, Unterhalten, Unterwandern*. zeithorizonte—Perspektiven Europäischer Ethnologie 12. Berlin: LIT, 2013.

Besenfelder, Sabine. *"Staatsnotwendige Wissenschaft": Die Tübinger Volkskunde in den 1930er und 1940er Jahren*. Untersuchungen des Ludwig-Uhland-Instituts der Universität Tübingen 94. Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 2002.

Bessel, Richard, and Ralph Jessen, eds. *Die Grenzen der Diktatur: Staat und Gesellschaft in der DDR*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Bialas, Wolfgang, and Anson Rabinbach, eds. *Nazi Germany and the Humanities*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2007.

Binder, Jana. "Globality: Eine Ethnographie über Backpacker." PhD diss., Goethe Universität Frankfurt am Main, 2005.

Bönisch-Brednich, Brigitte. *Volkskundliche Forschung in Schlesien: Eine Wissenschaftsgeschichte*. Marburg: Elwert, 1994.

———. "Von der Individualforschung zur institutionalisierten Wissenschaft: Das Beispiel Schlesien." In *Alltagskulturen zwischen Erinnerung und Geschichte:*

Beiträge zur Volkskunde der Deutschen im und aus dem östlichen Europa, edited by Kurt Dröge, 183–195. Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1995.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984.

———. *Homo Academicus*. Le sens commun. Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1984.

———. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Translated by John B. Thompson. Cambridge: Polity, 1991.

———. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

———. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Edited by Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

———. *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1990.

———. "The Specificity of the Scientific Field and the Social Conditions of the Progress of Reason." In *The Science Studies Reader*, edited by Mario Biagioli, 31–50. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and Jean Claude Passeron. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. SAGE Studies in Social and Educational Change 5. London: SAGE, 1977.

Boyer, Dominic. *Spirit and System: Media, Intellectuals, and the Dialectic in Modern German Culture*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005.

———. "Thinking through the Anthropology of Experts." *Anthropology in Action* 15, no. 2 (2008): 38–46.

Brecht, Bertolt. *Schriften zum Theater*. Vol. 6. Berlin: Suhrkamp, 1964.

Brednich, Rolf Wilhelm. "Das Weigelsche Sinnbildarchiv in Göttingen: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Ideologiekritik der National-Sozialistischen Volkskunde." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 81, no. 1 (1985): 1–21.

———. *Grundriß der Volkskunde: Einführung in die Forschungsfelder der europäischen Ethnologie*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1988.

———. *Grundriß der Volkskunde: Einführung in die Forschungsfelder der Europäischen Ethnologie*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1994. First published in 1988 by Dietrich Reimer.

Brepohl, Wilhelm. "Die Geschichtlichkeit des Volkstums und der Gegenstand der Volkskunde." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 52 (1955): 1–38.

Bresan, Annett. *Pawoł Nedo: 1908–1984. Ein biografischer Beitrag zur sorbischen Geschichte*. Bautzen: Domowina-Verlag, 2002.

Brinkel, Teresa. *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR: Zur Geschichte eines Faches und seiner Abwicklung*. Studien zur Kulturanthropologie / Europäische Ethnologie 6. Münster: LIT, 2012.

Brockmann, Stephen. *Literature and German Reunification*. Cambridge Studies in German. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Bromley, Julian V. "Ethnological Studies in the USSR, 1965–1969." In *Soviet Ethnology and Anthropology Today*, edited by Julian V. Bromley, 15–30. The Hague: Mouton, 1974.

———. *Ethnos und Ethnographie*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1977.

———. *Soviet Ethnography: Main Trends*. Moscow: Social Sciences Today, 1977.

Bromley, Julian V., ed. *Soviet Ethnology and Anthropology Today*. The Hague: Mouton, 1974.

Browning, Christopher R., and Leon Wieseltier. *The "Willing Executioners"—"Ordinary Men" Debate*. Washington, D.C.: United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 1996.

Brown, Timothy Scott. *West Germany and the Global Sixties: The Anti-Authoritarian Revolt, 1962–1978*. New Studies in European History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Bruck, Andreas. "Ist kulturwissenschaftliches Forschen schlechtestenfalls nur harmlos? Eine Antwort auf Sabine Künsting." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 87 (1991): 79–83.

———. "Vergangenheitsbewältigung?! Kritische Anmerkungen zur Aufarbeitung der Nationalsozialitischen Vergangenheit in der Volkskunde." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 86, no. 2 (1990): 177–202.

Brückner, Wolfgang. “Die Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Volkskunde und die Institutionen-Erforschungen in den Geisteswissenschaften.” In *Volkskunde als akademische Disziplin: Studien zur Institutionenausbildung: Referate eines Wissenschaftsgeschichtlichen Symposions vom 8.–10. Oktober 1982 in Würzburg*, edited by Wolfgang Brückner and Klaus Beitl, 13–32. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte 414. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1983.

———. *Falkensteiner Protokolle*. Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Volkskunde, 1971.

———. “‘Heimat und Demokratie’: Gedanken zum politischen Folklorismus in Westdeutschland.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 62, no. 1 (1965): 205–213.

———. “Nachlese zum Problem der Kulturwissenschaften in der ehemaligen DDR.” *Bayerische Blätter für Volkskunde*, no. 2 (1990): 139–149.

———. *Volkskunde als historische Kulturwissenschaft: Gesammelte Schriften*. Würzburg: Bayerische Blätter für Volkskunde, 2000.

———. “Volkskundler in der DDR.” *Bayerische Blätter für Volkskunde*, no. 2 (1990): 84–111.

———. “Zwanzig Jahre nach Falkenstein oder der Rückkehr zur pluralen Normalität.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 86, no. 2 (1990): 155–160.

Brückner, Wolfgang, and Klaus Beitl. “Idee und Zielsetzungen eines wissenschaftsgeschichtlichen Dokumentationszentriums in Mattersburg.” In *Volkskunde als akademische Disziplin: Studien zur Institutionenausbildung: Referate eines Wissenschaftsgeschichtlichen Symposions vom 8.–10. Oktober 1982 in Würzburg*, edited by Wolfgang Brückner and Klaus Beitl, 189–95. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte 414. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1983.

———. , eds. *Volkskunde als akademische Disziplin: Studien zur Institutionenausbildung: Referate eines Wissenschaftsgeschichtlichen Symposions vom 8.-10. Oktober 1982 in Würzburg*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte 414. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1983.

Buchowski, Michał. *Rethinking Transformation: An Anthropological Perspective on Post-Socialism*. Poznań: Humaniora, 2001.

Budick, Sanford, and Wolfgang Iser, eds. *The Translatability of Cultures: Figurations of the Space between*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1996.

Bullivant, Keith, and Bernhard Spies, eds. *Literarisches Krisenbewusstsein: Ein Perzeptions- und Produktionsmuster im 20. Jahrhundert*. Munich: Iudicium, 2001.

Burckhardt, Jacob. *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*. New York: Harper, 1958.

Burckhardt-Seebass, Christine, ed. *Zwischen den Stühlen fest im Sattel? Eine Diskussion um Zentrum, Perspektiven und Verbindungen des Faches Volkskunde. Hochschultagung der dfv, 31. Oktober–2. November 1996 in Basel*. Beiheft der dgv 5. Göttingen: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, 1997.

Caldwell, Peter C. *Dictatorship, State Planning, and Social Theory in the German Democratic Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Canguilhem, Georges. *Ideology and Rationality in the History of the Life Sciences*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1988.

———. *The Normal and the Pathological*. New York: Zone, 1989.

Castillo, Greg. *Cold War on the Home Front: The Soft Power of Midcentury Design*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.

Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California, 1986.

Confino, Alon. *Germany as a Culture of Remembrance: Promises and Limits of Writing History*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

Confino, Alon, and Peter Fritzsche, eds. *The Work of Memory: New Directions in the Study of German Society and Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002.

Connelly, John. "Humboldt Coopted: East German Universities, 1945–1989." In *German Universities, Past and Future: Crisis or Renewal?*, edited by Mitchell G. Ash, 55–76. Oxford: Berghahn, 1997.

Connelly, John, and Michael Grüttner. *Universities under Dictatorship*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005.

Control Council Directive No. 38. *Occupation and the Emergence of Two States, 1945–1961 (October 12, 1946)*. German History in Documents and Images, Vol. 8.

Accessed March 15, 2015. http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/pdf/eng/Denazification%202%20ENG.pdf.

Cooke, Paul, and Marc Silberman, eds. *Screening War: Perspectives on German Suffering*. Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2010.

Cox, Heinrich Leonard. "Karl Meisen." *Neue Deutsche Biographie*. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 1990. http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd139781196.html.

Crapanzano, Vincent. *Tuhami: Portrait of a Moroccan*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Dale, Gareth. *Popular Protest in East Germany*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Darieva, Tsypylma, Wolfgang Kaschuba, and Melanie Krebs, eds. *Urban Spaces after Socialism: Ethnographies of Public Places in Eurasian Cities*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2011.

Darnell, Regna. *And Along Came Boas: Continuity and Revolution in Americanist Anthropology*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 1998.

———. *Edward Sapir: Linguist, Anthropologist, Humanist*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

———. *Invisible Genealogies: A History of Americanist Anthropology*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001.

Darnell, Regna, and Julia D. Harrison, eds. *Historicizing Canadian Anthropology*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2006.

Daston, Lorraine, ed. *Biographies of Scientific Objects*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Daston, Lorraine, and Peter Galison. *Objectivity*. New York: Zone, 2007.

Davidovic-Walther, Antonia, and Michaela Fenske. "Exploring Ethnological Knowledges." *Journal of Folklore Research* 47, no. 1/2 (2010): 1–5.

Davidovic-Walther, Antonia, and Gisela Welz. "Community Studies as an Ethnographic Knowledge Format." *Journal of Folklore Research* 47, no. 1/2 (2010): 89–112.

Daxelmüller, Christoph. "Jüdische Volkskunde in Deutschland vor 1933." In *Volkskunde als akademische Disziplin: Studien zur Institutionenausbildung: Referate eines*

Wissenschaftsgeschichtlichen Symposions vom 8.–10. Oktober 1982 in Würzburg, edited by Wolfgang Brückner and Klaus Beitl, 117–142. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte 414. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1983.

———. "Nationalsozialistisches Kulturverständnis und das Ende der jüdischen Volkskunde." In *Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus: Referate und Diskussionen einer Tagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, München, 23. bis 25. Oktober 1986*, edited by Helge Gerndt, 149–168. Munich: Münchner Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1989.

Deichmann, Ute. *Biologists under Hitler*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Deißner, Vera. "Zur Geschichte volkskundlicher Fachgeschichtsschreibung bis 1931." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 93 (1997): 57–76.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

———. *What Is Philosophy?*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. "GEPRIS: Geförderte Projekte der DFG." *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*. Accessed February 24, 2015. http://gepris.dfg.de/gepris/OCTOPUS?task=showSearchSimple.

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Völkerkunde. "Public Manifesto of German Ethnologists Assembled at Frankfort from September 19th–21st 1946." *Royal Anthropological Institute, Honorary Officers' Correspondence and Papers (A95–03 of 05)*, 1946.

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde. "Zur Situation der Volkskunde 1945-1970: Orientierungen einer Wissenschaft in Zeiten des 'Kalten Krieges.'" Ludwig-Maximilian-Universität München, 09.–11.5.2013." Conference Program, 2013. http://www.d-g-v.org/sites/default/files/programm_tagung_fachgeschichte_1945_bis_1970_neu.pdf.

Dietzsch, Ina. *Grenzen überschreiben?: Deutsch-deutsche Briefwechsel 1949–1989*. Cologne: Böhlau, 2004.

Dietzsch, Ina, Wolfgang Kaschuba, and Leonore Scholze-Irrlitz, eds. *Horizonte ethnografischen Wissens: Eine Bestandsaufnahme*. Cologne: Böhlau, 2009.

Doering-Manteuffel, Sabine. “Das Weltkind in der Mitte: Hermann Bausinger zum 70. Geburtstag.” *Augsburger Volkskundliche Nachrichten* 2, no. 2 (1996): 33–51.

Douglas, Mary. *How Institutions Think*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1986.

Dow, James R. “German Volkskunde and National Socialism.” *The Journal of American Folklore* 100, no. 397 (1987): 300–304.

———. “Hans Naumann’s Gesunkenes Kulturgut and Primitive Gemeinschaftskultur.” *Journal of Folklore Research* 51, no. 1 (2014): 49–100.

———. “There Is No Grand Theory in Germany, and for Good Reason.” *Journal of Folklore Research* 45, no. 1 (2008): 55–62.

Dow, James R., and Olaf Bockhorn. *The Study of European Ethnology in Austria*. Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2004.

Dow, James R., and Hannjost Lixfeld, eds. *German Volkskunde: A Decade of Theoretical Confrontation, Debate, and Reorientation (1967–1977)*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.

———. “National Socialistic Folklore and Overcoming the Past in the Federal Republic of Germany.” *Asian Folklore Studies* 50, no. 1 (1991): 117–153.

———. , eds. *The Nazification of an Academic Discipline: Folklore in the Third Reich*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.

Dracklé, Dorle. “Farewell to Humboldt? Teaching and Learning Anthropology in Germany.” In *Educational Histories of European Social Anthropology*, edited by Dorle Dracklé, Iain R. Edgar, and Thomas K. Schippers, 56–68. New York: Berghahn, 2003.

Dundes, Alan. “Folkloristics in the Twenty-First Century (AFS Invited Presidential Plenary Address, 2004).” *Journal of American Folklore* 118, no. 470 (2005): 385–408.

———. , ed. *International Folkloristics: Classic Contributions by the Founders of Folklore*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999.

———. “Volkskunde, Völkerkunde and the Study of German National Character.” In *Europäische Ethnologie*, edited by Heide Nixdorff and Thomas Hauschild, 257–66. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1982.

Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen. "Institute and Discipline." *Ludwig-Uhland-Institut für Empirische Kulturwissenschaft*. Accessed April 17, 2015. http://www.uni-tuebingen.de/en/faculties/economics-and-social-sciences/subjects/historical-and-cultural-anthropology/institut.html.

———. "Institut und Fach." *Ludwig-Uhland-Institut für Empirische Kulturwissenschaft*. Accessed April 17, 2015. http://www.wiso.uni-tuebingen.de/faecher/empirische-kulturwissenschaft/institut.html.

Eckhard, John, and Wolfgang Steinitz. *Die Entdeckung des sozialkritischen Liedes: Zum 100. Geburtstag von Wolfgang Steinitz*. Münster: Waxmann, 2006.

Eggmann, Sabine. *"Kultur"-Konstruktionen: Die gegenwärtige Gesellschaft im Spiegel volkskundlich-kulturwissenschaftlichen Wissens*. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2009.

Ehlers, Klaas-Hinrich. *Der Wille zur Relevanz: Die Sprachforschung und ihre Förderung durch die DFG 1920–1970*. Stuttgart: Steiner, 2010.

Eisman, April. "East German Art and the Permeability of the Berlin Wall." *German Studies Review* 38, no. 2 (2015): forthcoming.

Ellwein, Thomas. *Die deutsche Universität vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*. Wiesbaden: Fourier, 1997.

Emmerich, Wolfgang. *Kleine Literaturgeschichte der DDR*. 4. erweiterte Neuausgabe. Berlin: Aufbau, 2009.

———. *Zur Kritik der Volkstumsideologie*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1971.

Erich, Oswald Adolf, and Richard Beitl. *Wörterbuch der deutschen Volkskunde*. Stuttgart: A. Kröner, 1955.

Erixon, Sigurd. *Erixoniana: Contributions to the Study of European Ethnology in Memory of Sigurd Erixon*. Arnhem, 1970.

———. "Folk-Life Research in Our Time: From a Swedish Point of View." *Gwerin* 6, no. 3 (1962): 275–91.

———. "Folklivsforskningen som universitetsämne." *Folk-Liv*, 1944, 286–313.

———. "Regional European Ethnology." *Folk-Liv*, 1937, 89–108.

Erixon, Sigurd Emanuel. *Ethnologie régionale ou folklore*. Stockholm: Meddelanden fran Institutet for folklivsforskning, 1951.

———. *European Ethnology as a Social Science*. Arnheim, 1955.

———. "European Ethnology in Our Time." *Ethnologia Europaea* 1, no. 1 (1967): 3–11.

"Europäische Ethnologie / Volkskunde." *Seminar für Europäische Ethnologie / Volkskunde, Christian-Albrechts-Universitaet zu Kiel*. Accessed February 25, 2015. http://www.europaeische-ethnologie-volkskunde.uni-kiel.de/de/profil.

Europa-Universität Viadrina Frankfurt (Oder). "Professur für Vergleichende Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie." *Europa-Universität Viadrina Frankfurt (Oder)*. Accessed February 24, 2015. http://www.kuwi.europa-uni.de/de/lehrstuhl/vs/anthro/index.html.

European Association of Social Anthropologists, Antonia Pedroso de Lima, Sydel Silverman, and Adam Kuper. "EASA Beyond Crises: Continuities and Innovations in European Anthropology. On the History of the EASA." *EASA—European Association of Social Anthropologists*, 2014. http://www.easaonline.org/about/history.shtml.

Evans, Andrew D. *Anthropology at War: World War I and the Science of Race in Germany*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2010.

Fairclough, Norman. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman, 1995.

———. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity, 1992.

———. *Language and Power*. London: Longman, 1989.

Fairclough, Norman, and Ruth Wodak. "Critical Discourse Analysis." In *Discourse as Social Interaction*, edited by Teun A. van Dijk, 258–284. London: SAGE, 1997.

"Falkenstein vergessen?—Wir erinnern! (Reprint of 1989 Wahmbecker Resolution)." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 86, no. 2 (1990): 161–163.

Fehrle, Eugen. "Die Staatsführung ist die angewandte Heimatkunde." *Mein Heimatland* 22 (1935): 61–65.

Fenske, Michaela. “The Undoing of an Encyclopedia: Knowledge Practices within German Folklore Studies after World War II.” *Journal of Folklore Research* 47, no. 1/2 (2010): 51–78.

Fernandez, James W., ed. *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 1991.

Fischer, Hans. *Völkerkunde im Nationalsozialismus: Aspekte der Anpassung, Affinität und Behauptung einer wissenschaftlichen Disziplin*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1990.

Fischer, Torben, and Matthias N. Lorenz, eds. *Lexikon der “Vergangenheitsbewältigung” in Deutschland: Debatten- und Diskursgeschichte des Nationalsozialismus nach 1945*. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2007.

Fleck, Christian. *A Transatlantic History of the Social Sciences Robber Barons, the Third Reich and the Invention of Empirical Social Research*. Translated by Hella Beister. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2011.

Flitner, Andreas, ed. *Deutsches Geistesleben und Nationalsozialismus: Eine Vortragsreihe der Universität Tübingen*. Tübingen: Wunderlich, 1965.

Knowlton, James, and Truett Cates, trans. *Forever in the Shadow of Hitler?: Original Documents of the Historikerstreit, the Controversy Concerning the Singularity of the Holocaust*. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities, 1993.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Pantheon, 1977.

———. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. New York: Pantheon, 1965.

———. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Translated by Alan M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon, 1972.

———. *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*. New York: Pantheon, 1973.

———. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Pantheon, 1971.

Fox, Thomas C. *Stated Memory: East Germany and the Holocaust*. Studies in German Literature, Linguistics, and Culture. Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 1999.

Freckmann, Klaus. “Hausforschung im Dritten Reich.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 78, no. 2 (1982): 169–186.

———. “Zur Foto- und Plandokumentation in der Hausforschung der 30er und 40er Jahre: Das Beispiel des ehemaligen ‘Bauernhofbüros’ Berlin/Münster.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 81, no. 1 (1985): 40–50.

Freudenthal, Herbert. “Volkstum und Bildung.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 54, no. 1 (1958): 1–11.

Friedrich, Paul. “Polytropy.” In *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, edited by James W. Fernandez, 17–55. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 1991.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Fuchs, Anne, Mary Cosgrove, and Georg Grote, eds. *German Memory Contests: The Quest for Identity in Literature, Film, and Discourse Since 1990*. Studies in German Literature, Linguistics, and Culture. Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2006.

Fuchs, Anne, Kathleen James-Chakraborty, and Linda Shortt, eds. *Debating German Cultural Identity since 1989*. Studies in German Literature, Linguistics, and Culture. Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2011.

Fulbrook, Mary. *Anatomy of a Dictatorship: Inside the GDR, 1949–1989*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

———. *The Divided Nation: A History of Germany, 1918-1990*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

———. *The People’s State: East German Society from Hitler to Honecker*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2005.

———. *The Two Germanies, 1945-1990: Problems of Interpretation*. Studies in European History. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan, 1992.

Gaugele, Elke. “Von Zeiten und Zeichen: Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann (1918–1993).” In *Mass nehmen, Mass halten: Frauen im Fach Volkskunde*, edited by Elsbeth Wallnöfer, 79–112. Vienna: Böhlau, 2008.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

———. *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 1988.

Genette, Gérard. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1980.

Georget, Jean-Louis. "Welche Zukunftsaussichten hat die Volkskunde? Eine Wissenschaft zwischen deutscher Nostalgie und europäischer Offnung." In *Das Populäre: Untersuchungen zu Interaktionen und Differenzierungsstrategien in Literatur, Kultur und Sprache*, edited by Olivier Agard, Christian Helmreich, and Hélène Vinckel-Roisin, 267–280. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.

Gerholm, Tomas. "Sweden: Central Ethnology, Peripheral Anthropology." In *Fieldwork and Footnotes: Studies in the History of European Anthropology*, edited by Han F. Vermeulen, Arturo Alvarez Roldán, and European Association of Social Anthropologists, 159–70. London: Routledge, 1995.

Gerndt, Helge. "Deutsche Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus: Was haben wir aus der Geschichte gelernt?" *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde* 91, no. 1 (1995): 53–75.

———. *Fach und Begriff "Volkskunde" in der Diskussion*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988.

———. *Kulturwissenschaft im Zeitalter der Globalisierung: Volkskundliche Markierungen*. Münster: Waxmann, 2002.

———. *Studienskript Volkskunde: Eine Handreichung für Studierende*. Münster: Waxmann, 1997.

———. "Vergleichende Volkskunde: Zur Bedeutung des Vergleichs in der volkskundlichen Methodik. Leopold Kretzenbacher zum 60. Geburtstag." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 68 (1972): 179–95.

———. , ed. *Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus: Referate und Diskussionen einer Tagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, München, 23. bis 25. Oktober 1986*. Munich: Münchner Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1989.

———. "Zielorientierungen oder: Wieviele Kulturbegriffe braucht Volkskunde als empirische Kulturwissenschaft." In *Kultur—Ein interdisziplinäres Kolloquium zur Begrifflichkeit, Halle an der Saale, 18. bis 21. Februar 1999*, edited by Siegfried Fröhlich, 215–28. Halle an der Saale: Landesamt für Denkmalpflege und Archäologie Sachsen-Anhalt, 2000.

———. “Zur Perspektive volkskundlicher Forschung.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 76 (1980): 22–36.

Gerndt, Helge, and Elfriede Grabner. *Leopold Kretzenbacher—Vergleichende Volkskunde Europas: Gesamtbibliographie mit Register, 1936–1999*. Münster: Waxmann, 2000.

Gerndt, Helge, Leopold Kretzenbacher, and Georg R. Schroubek. *Vergleichende Volkskunde: Bibliographie Leopold Kretzenbacher aus Anlass seines 65. Geburtstages*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Würzburg: Bayerische Blätter für Volkskunde, 1977.

Gerstenberger, Katharina. *German Literature in a New Century: Trends, Traditions, Transitions, Transformations*. New York: Berghahn, 2008.

Geuter, Ulfried. “The Uses of History for the Shaping of a Field: Observations on German Psychology.” In *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*, edited by Loren R. Graham, Wolf Lepenies, and Peter Weingart, 191–228. Sociology of the Sciences 7. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1983.

Giesen, Bernhard. *Intellectuals and the German Nation: Collective Identity in an Axial Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Gingrich, André. “The German-Speaking Countries.” In *One Discipline, Four Ways: British, German, French, and American Anthropology*, by André Gingrich, Fredrik Barth, Robert Parkin, and Sydel Silverman, 61–153. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Glaeser, Andreas. *Divided in Unity: Identity, Germany, and the Berlin Police*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Glaser, Barney G., and Anselm L. Strauss. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1959.

Goldhagen, Daniel Jonah. *Hitler’s Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*. New York: Knopf, 1996.

Göttsch, Silke, and Albrecht Lehmann, eds. *Methoden der Volkskunde: Positionen, Quellen und Arbeitsweisen der Europäischen Ethnologie*. 3. überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 2007.

Graham, Loren R., Wolf Lepenies, and Peter Weingart, eds. *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*. Sociology of the Sciences 7. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1983.

Grass, Günter. *Beim Häuten der Zwiebel*. 1. Aufl. Göttingen: Steidl, 2006.

Green, Thomas A. *Folklore: An Encyclopedia of Beliefs, Customs, Tales, Music, and Art*. Westport, Conn.: ABC-CLIO, 1997.

———. "Peuckert's Handwörterbuch and the Making of Twentieth-Century Encyclopedias." *Journal of Folklore Research* 47, no. 1 (2010): 79–88.

Greverus, Ina-Maria. *Anthropologisch reisen*. Münster: LIT, 2002.

———. *Auf der Suche nach Heimat*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1979.

———. *Der territoriale Mensch: Ein literaturanthropologischer Versuch zum Heimatphänomen*. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1972.

———. *Kultur und Alltagswelt: Eine Einführung in Fragen der Kulturanthropologie*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1978.

———. "Kulturanthropologie und Kulturethologie: 'Wende zur Lebenswelt' und 'Wende zur Natur.'" *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 67, no. 1 (1971): 13–25.

———. "Touching Life: Anthropological Encounters with Aesthetics." In *Aesthetics and Anthropology: Performing Life—Performed Lives*, edited by Ina Maria Greverus and Ute Ritschel, translated by Amanda Randall, 27–96. Münster: LIT, 2009.

———. "Über Kultur und Alltagswelt." *Ethnologia Europaea* 9, no. 2 (1976): 199–211.

———. "Walking on Borderlines, Crossing Frontiers: Reflections on the Journeys of a Grenzgänger Journal." *Anthropological Journal on European Cultures* 21, no. 2 (2012): 9–19.

———. "Zu einem Curriculum für das Fachgebiet Kulturanthropologie." *Ethnologia Europaea* 5 (1971): 214–24.

Greverus, Ina-Maria, ed. *Forschendes Lernen und der Studentenberg: Aus dem Alltag eines Uni-Institutes*. Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie, 1980.

———. , ed. *Kulturtexte: 20 Jahre Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie*. Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie der Universität Frankfurt am Main, 1994.

Greverus, Ina-Maria, and Christian Giordano, eds. *Kultur anthropologisch: Eine Festschrift für Ina-Maria Greverus*. Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie der Universität Frankfurt am Main, 1989.

Greverus, Ina-Maria, Christian Giordano, and Regina Römhild, eds. *The Politics of Anthropology at Home. Fifth Biennial Conference of the European Association of Social Anthropologists, Frankfurt am Main, 1998*. Anthropological Journal on European Cultures 8.1. Hamburg: LIT, 1999.

———. , eds. *The Politics of Anthropology at Home. Fifth Biennial Conference of the European Association of Social Anthropologists, Frankfurt Am Main, 1998*. Anthropological Journal on European Cultures 8.2. Münster: LIT, 2000.

Greverus, Ina-Maria, Konrad Köstlin, and Heinz Schilling, eds. *Kulturkontakt, Kulturkonflikt: Zur Erfahrung des Fremden. 26. Deutscher Volkskundekongress in Frankfurt vom 28. September bis 2. Oktober 1987*. Vol. 1. Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie der Universität Frankfurt am Main, 1988.

———. , eds. *Kulturkontakt, Kulturkonflikt: Zur Erfahrung des Fremden. 26. Deutscher Volkskundekongress in Frankfurt vom 28. September bis 2. Oktober 1987*. Vol. 2. Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie der Universität Frankfurt am Main, 1988.

Greverus, Ina-Maria, Regina Römhild, and Gisela Welz, eds. *The Mediterraneans: Transborder Movements and Diasporas*. Münster: LIT, 2001.

Grimm, Reinhold, Jost Hermand, Peter Uwe Hohendahl, and Egon Schwarz, eds. *Exil und innere Emigration*. Wisconsin Workshop. Internationale Tagung in St. Louis. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1972.

Grober-Glueck, Gerda. "Zum Abschluss des Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde—Neue Folge. Ein Beitrag zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Volkskunde." In *Wandel der Volkskultur in Europa: Festschrift für Günter Wiegelmann zum 60. Geburtstag*, edited by Günter Wiegelmann and Nils Arvid Bringéus, 53–71. Münster: F. Coppenrath, 1988.

Groffmann, Anne Claire, Beatrice Ploch, Ute Ritschel, and Regina Römhild, eds. *Kulturanthropologinnen im Dialog: ein Buch für und mit Ina-Maria Greverus*. Königstein/Taunus: U. Helmer, 1997.

Gumperz, John J., and Dell H. Hymes. *Directions in Sociolinguistics; the Ethnography of Communication.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Gusterson, Hugh. *Nuclear Rites: A Weapons Laboratory at the End of the Cold War*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Gutting, Gary. *Michel Foucault's Archaeology of Scientific Reason*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Gyr, Ueli. "Touristenkultur und Reisealltag: Volkskundlicher Nachholbedarf in der Tourismusforschung." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 84 (1988): 224–40.

Haar, Ingo. *Historiker im Nationalsozialismus: Deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft und der "Volkstumskampf" im Osten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Heritage of Sociology. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

———. *The Collective Memory, with an Introduction by Mary Douglas*. New York: Harper-Colophon Books, 1950.

Haller, Adam Johannes. "Zum Geleit." *Die Umschau: Internationale Revue* 1, no. 1 (September 1946): 1–10.

Haller, Dieter. *Die Suche nach dem Fremden: Geschichte der Ethnologie in der Bundesrepublik 1945–1990*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2012.

Halverson, Rachel J. *Historiography and Fiction: Siegfried Lenz and the "Historikerstreit."* German Life and Civilization 8. New York: P. Lang, 1990.

Hann, Chris M. *Postsocialism: Ideals, Ideologies, and Practices in Eurasia*. London: Routledge, 2002.

———. "Preface." In *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies: Socialist Era Anthropology in East-Central Europe*, edited by Chris M. Hann, Mihály Sárkány, and Peter Skalník, ix – x. Münster: LIT, 2005.

Hann, Chris M., Mihály Sárkány, and Peter Skalník, eds. *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies: Socialist Era Anthropology in East-Central Europe*. Münster: LIT, 2005.

Harvolk, Edgar. *Eichenzweig und Hakenkreuz: Die Deutsche Akademie in München (1924–1962) und ihre volkskundliche Sektion*. Munich: Münchner Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1990.

Haug, Wolfgang Fritz. *Der hilflose Antifaschismus: Zur Kritik der Vorlesungsreihen über Wissenschaft und NS an deutschen Universitäten*. 2. überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage. Edition Suhrkamp 236. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1968.

Hauschild, Thomas. *Charisma, Stigma und der Dritte: Politisches Heil in einer subalternen Kultur der katholischen Welt*. Konstanz: Univ. SFB 485, 2004.

———. "Christians, Jews and the Other in German Anthropology." *American Anthropologist* 99, no. 4 (1997): 746–753.

———. *Der böse Blick: Ideengeschichtliche und sozialpsychologische Untersuchungen*. Berlin: Verlag Mensch und Leben, 1982.

———. *Lebenslust und Fremdenfurcht: Ethnologie im Dritten Reich*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1995.

———. *Magie und Macht in Italien: Über Frauenzauber, Kirche und Politik*. Gifkendorf: Merlin, 2002.

———. *Ritual und Gewalt: Ethnologische Studien an europäischen und mediterranen Gesellschaften*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2008.

———. "Völkerkundler im 'Dritten Reich.'" In *Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus: Referate und Diskussionen einer Tagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, München, 23. bis 25. Oktober 1986*, edited by Helge Gerndt, 245–260. Munich: Münchner Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1989.

———. "Volkskunde und Völkerkunde." *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Völkerkunde* 36 (2006). http://www.evifa.de/cms/fileadmin/uploads/dgvoe_forum_texte/Beitrag_Hauschild_13-05-06.pdf.

———. "Zur Einführung—Formen Europäischer Ethnologie." In *Europäische Ethnologie*, edited by Heide Nixdorff and Thomas Hauschild, 11–28. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1982.

Hauschild, Thomas, and Bernd Jürgen Warneken, eds. *Inspecting Germany: Internationale Deutschland-Ethnographie der Gegenwart*. Münster: LIT, 2002.

Hausmann, Frank-Rutger, ed. *Die Rolle der Geisteswissenschaften im Dritten Reich, 1933–1945*. Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 2002.

Hebdige, Dick. *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. Abingdon, U.K.: Taylor & Francis, 1979.

Heilfurth, Gerhard. "Volkskunde jenseits der Ideologien: Zum Problemstand des Faches im Blickfeld empirischer Forschung." *Hessische Blätter für Volkskunde* 53 (1962): 9–28.

Herf, Jeffrey. *Divided Memory: The Nazi Past in the Two Germanys*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Hermand, Jost. *Kultur in finsteren Zeiten: Nazifaschismus, Innere Emigration, Exil*. Cologne: Böhlau, 2010.

Hermand, Jost, and Wigand Lange. *Wollt ihr Thomas Mann wiederhaben?: Deutschland und die Emigranten*. Hamburg: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1999.

Hermans, Theo. *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985.

Herzog, Reinhart. "On the Relation of Disciplinary Development and Historical Self-Presentation: The Case of Classical Philology since the End of the Eighteenth Century." In *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*, edited by Loren R. Graham, Wolf Lepenies, and Peter Weingart, 281–290. Sociology of the Sciences 7. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1983.

Hesse, Wolfgang, and Christian Schröter. "Sammeln als Wissenschaft: Fotografie und Film im 'Institut für deutsche Volkskunde Tübingen' 1933–1945." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 81, no. 1 (1985): 51–75.

Heß, Pamela. *Geschichte als Politikum: Öffentliche und private Kontroversen um die Deutung der DDR-Vergangenheit*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2014.

Hirsch, Marianne. *Family Frames: Photography, Narrative, and Postmemory*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997.

———. *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

"History." *Bologna Process—European Higher Education Area*, 2014. http://www.ehea.info/article-details.aspx?ArticleId=3.

Hochscherf, Tobias. *Divided, But Not Disconnected: German Experiences of the Cold War*. New York: Berghahn, 2013.

Hodgin, Nick, and Caroline Pearce, eds. *The GDR Remembered: Representations of the East German State since 1989*. Studies in German Literature Linguistics and Culture 106. Rochester, N.Y.: Boydell & Brewer, 2011.

Hoffmann, Christa. *Stunden Null?: Vergangenheitsbewältigung in Deutschland 1945 und 1989*. Bonn: Bouvier, 1992.

Hoffmann, Christhard. "One Nation—Which Past? Historiography and German Identities in the 1990s." *German Politics and Society* 43 (1997): 1–7.

Hoffmann, Dieter, and Mark Walker. *The German Physical Society in the Third Reich*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Holzapfel, Otto. "Vergangenheitsbewältigung gegen den Strich: Überlegungen zur Debatte; John Meier und das Ahnenerbe." *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 14 (1991): 101–114.

Horan, Geraldine. *Mothers, Warriors, Guardians of the Soul: Female Discourse in National Socialism, 1924–1934*. Studia Linguistica Germanica 68. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003.

Huizer, Gerrit, Bruce Mannheim, and International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, eds. *The Politics of Anthropology: From Colonialism and Sexism toward a View from Below*. The Hague: Mouton, 1979.

Hutton, Christopher. *Linguistics and the Third Reich: Mother-Tongue Fascism, Race and the Science of Language*. London: Routledge, 1999.

———. *Race and the Third Reich: Linguistics, Racial Anthropology and Genetics in the Dialectic of Volk*. Cambridge: Polity, 2005.

Huyssen, Andreas. "After the Wall: The Failure of German Intellectuals." *New German Critique* 52 (1991): 109–143.

———. "German Painting in the Cold War." *New German Critique* 110 (2010): 209–227.

———. *Present Pasts: Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2003.

———. "The Inevitability of Nation: German Intellectuals after Unification." *October* 61 (1992): 65–73.

Hymes, Dell H. *Reinventing Anthropology*. 1st ed. New York: Pantheon, 1972.

International Society for Ethnology and Folklore. "History of SIEF." *SIEF—International Society for Ethnology and Folklore*, October 6, 2008. http://www.siefhome.org/about/history.shtml.

Iser, Wolfgang. *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.

Jacobeit, Sigrid. "Die 'Anthropologie der nichtsbesitzenden Klassen' von Alfredo Niceforo (1910) als wissenschaftliche Quelle für eine Ethnographie / Volkskunde des Proletariats." In *Beiträge zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Volkskunde im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, edited by Kai Detlev Sievers, 195–205. Neumünster: K. Wachholtz, 1991.

Jacobeit, Wolfgang. "Auseinandersetzung mit der NS-Zeit in der DDR-Volkskunde." In *Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus: Referate und Diskussionen einer Tagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, München, 23. bis 25. Oktober 1986*, edited by Helge Gerndt, 301–18. Munich: Münchner Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1989.

———. *Bäuerliche Arbeit und Wirtschaft: Ein Beitrag zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der deutschen Volkskunde*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1965.

———. "Concerning the Traditional Understanding of 'Folk Culture' in the German Democratic Republic: A Scholarly-Historical Perspective." *Asian Folklore Studies* 50, no. 1 (1991): 67–94.

———. "Die Volkskunde, eine eigenständige historische Disziplin." *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 22, no. 4 (1974): 443–447.

———. "Dreißig Jahre Ethnographie an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin 1952–1982." *Ethnographisch-archäologische Zeitschrift* 27, no. 1 (1986): 13–26.

———. “Ethnologie und Alltagsgeschichte: Zum Gegenstand von Völkerkunde und Volkskunde.” *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde* 88, no. 3/4 (1992): 129–141.

———. “Intensification of International Cooperation in the Field of European Agrarian Ethnography.” *Current Anthropology* 5 (1964): 179–190.

———. “The Genesis of Volkskunde in the German Democratic Republic.” In *Studying Peoples in the People’s Democracies: Socialist Era Anthropology in East-Central Europe*, edited by Chris M. Hann, Mihály Sárkány, and Peter Skalník, 184–189. Münster: LIT, 2005.

———. *Von West nach Ost und zurück: Autobiographisches eines Grenzgängers zwischen Tradition und Novation*. Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot, 2000.

———. “Zur Aufgabenstellung der marxistischen Volkskunde im entwickelten gesellschaftlichen System des Sozialismus.” *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*, Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe, 20, no. 1 (1971): 48–57.

———. “Zur Geschichte der deutschen Volkskunde.” *Acta ethnographica Academiae scientiarum Hungaricae*, 1966, 75–91.

Jacobeit, Wolfgang, and Wolfgang Kaschuba. *Alltagskultur im Umbruch: Festschrift für Wolfgang Jacobeit zu seinem 75. Geburtstag*. Weimar: Böhlau, 1996.

Jacobeit, Wolfgang, Hannjost Lixfeld, and Olaf Bockhorn, eds. *Völkische Wissenschaft: Gestalten und Tendenzen der deutschen und österreichischen Volkskunde in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Vienna: Böhlau, 1994.

Jacobeit, Wolfgang, and Ute Mohrmann. “Zum Gegenstand und zur Aufgabenstellung der Volkskunde in der DDR.” *Letopis* 11/12 (1968): 94–103.

———. “Zur Geschichte der volkskundlichen Lehre unter Adolf Spamer an der Berliner Universität (1933–1945).” *Ethnographisch-archäologische Zeitschrift* 23 (1982): 283–98.

Jacobeit, Wolfgang, and Pawoł Nedo. *Probleme und Methoden volkskundlicher Gegenwartsforschung: Vorträge und Diskussionen einer internationalen Arbeitstagung in Bad Saarow 1967*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1969.

Jacobsen, Johanna Micaela. “Boundary Breaking and Compliance: Will-Erich Peuckert and 20th Century German Volkskunde.” PhD Diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2007. ProQuest (AAI3271772).

Jaspers, Karl. *Die Schuldfrage: Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Frage*. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1946.

Jauss, Hans Robert. “Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory.” Translated by Elizabeth Benzinger. *New Literary History* 2, no. 1 (1970): 7–37.

———. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Translated by Timothy Bahti. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.

Jeggle, Utz. “Beharrung oder Wandel? Fragen an eine kulturanthropologisch ausgerichtete Ethnologie.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 67, no. 1 (1971): 26–37.

———. “Volkskunde im 20. Jahrhundert.” In *Grundriß der Volkskunde: Einführung in die Forschungsfelder der europäischen Ethnologie*, edited by Rolf Wilhelm Brednich, 51–72. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1994.

———. “Weitere Bemerkungen zu einem offenen Thema.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 67, no. 2 (1971): 247ff.

Jessen, Ralph. “Between Control and Collaboration: The University in East Germany.” In *Universities under Dictatorship*, edited by John Connelly and Michael Grüttner, 245–82. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005.

Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main. “Lehrforschungsprojekte.” *Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie*. Accessed March 13, 2015. http://kaee.uni-frankfurt.de/?page_id=89.

———. “Studiengänge: Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie.” *Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main: Studienangebot*. Accessed March 13, 2015. https://www.uni-frankfurt.de/36027018/kult1.

Johansen, Ulla. “Ethnologie in der DDR.” In *Ethnologie: Eine Einführung*, edited by Hans Fischer, 303–18. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1983.

Johler, Reinhard. “Ach Europa! Zur Zukunft der Volkskunde.” In *Volkskunde ’00: Hochschulreform und Fachidentität. Hochschultagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde*, edited by Hochschultagung and Gudrun M. König. Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 2001.

———. “Doing European Ethnology in a Time of Change: The Metamorphosis of a Discipline (in Germany and Europe).” *Traditiones* 41, no. 2 (2012): 245–255.

———. “‘Europa in Zahlen’: Statistik—Vergleich—Volkskunde—EU.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 95, no. 2 (1999): 246–263.

———. “Laboratory Conditions: German-Speaking Volkskunde and the Great War.” In *Doing Anthropology in Wartime and War Zones: World War I and the Cultural Sciences in Europe*, edited by Reinhard Johler, Christian Marchetti, and Monique Scheer, 123–40. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2010.

———. Interview by Amanda Randall, May 18, 2011.

Johler, Reinhard, Ansgar Thiel, Josef Schmid, and Rainer Treptow, eds. *Europa und seine Fremden: Die Gestaltung kultureller Vielfalt als Herausforderung*. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2007.

Johler, Reinhard, Bernhard Tschofen, and Esther Hoffmann, eds. *Empirische Kulturwissenschaft: Eine Tübinger Enzyklopädie. Der Reader des Ludwig-Uhland-Instituts*. Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 2008.

Judt, Tony. *Postwar: A History of Europe since 1945*. New York: Penguin, 2005.

Kaes, Anton. *Deutschlandbilder: Die Wiederkehr der Geschichte als Film*. Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 1987.

Kansteiner, Wulf. *In Pursuit of German Memory: History, Television, and Politics after Auschwitz*. 1st ed. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2006.

Kapchan, Deborah A. “Performance.” *The Journal of American Folklore* 108, no. 430 (1995): 479–508.

Karasek-Langer, Alfred. “Volkskundliche Wandlungen in Deutschland.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 50, no. 1/2 (1953): 35–48.

Kaschuba, Wolfgang. *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1999.

———. “Folklore and Culturalism.” *Journal of Folklore Research* 36, no. 3 (1999): 173–178.

———. “Kulturalismus: Vom Verschwinden des Sozialen im gesellschaftlichen Diskurs.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 91 (1995): 27–45.

———. , ed. *Wissensgeschichte als Gesellschaftsgeschichte*. Vol. 4. Geschichte und Gesellschaft 34. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.

Kaschuba, Wolfgang, Gottfried Korff, and Bernd Jürgen Warneken, eds. *Arbeiterkultur seit 1945, Ende oder Veränderung?*. Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1991.

Kaschuba, Wolfgang, and Ute Mohrmann. *Blick-Wechsel Ost-West: Beobachtungen zur Alltagskultur in Ost- und Westdeutschland*. Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1992.

Kattago, Siobhan. *Ambiguous Memory: The Nazi Past and German National Identity*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 2001.

Kehl, Matthias. "Zur Etablierung der marxistisch-leninistischen Volkskunde am Zentralinstitut für Geschichte." In *Historische Forschung und sozialistische Diktatur: Beiträge zur Geschichtswissenschaft der DDR*, edited by Martin Sabrow and Peter Walther, 244–265. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 1995.

Kettler, David, and Gerhard Lauer. *Exile, Science, and Bildung: The Contested Legacies of German Emigre Intellectuals*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Klemperer, Victor. *LTI: Notizbuch eines Philologen*. Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag, 1949.

Klessmann, Christoph. *Die doppelte Staatsgründung: Deutsche Geschichte 1945–1955*. Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, 1986.

———. *The Divided Past: Rewriting Post-War German History*. New York: Berg, 2001.

———. *Zwei Staaten, eine Nation: Deutsche Geschichte 1955-1970*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988.

Klüger, Ruth. *Weiter Leben. Eine Jugend*. Göttingen: Wallstein, 1992.

Knobloch, Clemens. *Volkhafte Sprachforschung: Studien zum Umbau der Sprachwissenschaft in Deutschland zwischen 1918 und 1945*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2005.

Knorr-Cetina, Karin. *The Manufacture of Knowledge: An Essay on the Constructivist and Contextual Nature of Science*. Oxford: Pergamon, 1981.

Knorr-Cetina, Karin, and Michael J. Mulkay. *Science Observed: Perspectives on the Social Study of Science*. London: SAGE, 1983.

Kocka, Jürgen. *Civil Society and Dictatorship in Modern German History*. The Menahem Stern Jerusalem Lectures. Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 2010.

———. *Sozialgeschichte und Kulturanthropologie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

Kocka, Jürgen, and Renate Mayntz. *Wissenschaft und Wiedervereinigung: Disziplinen im Umbruch*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1998.

Kockel, Ullrich, Mairead Nic Craith, and Jonas Frykman, eds. *A Companion to the Anthropology of Europe*. Hoboken: John Wiley, 2012.

Koffer, Blanka. "(Post-)Sozialistischer Arbeitsalltag in den Geisteswissenschaften am Beispiel der Ethnographie in der DDR." In *Erinnerungen nach der Wende: Oral History und (post)sozialistische Gesellschaften*, edited by Julia Obertreis and Anke Stephan, 345–357. Essen: Klartext, 2009.

———. "Wissenschaftliche Arbeit im Wandel am Beispiel der DDR-Volkskunde nach 1989." In *Flexible Biografien?: Horizonte und Brüche im Arbeitsleben der Gegenwart*, edited by Manfred Seifert, 215–226. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2007.

Kölbel, Martin. *Ein Buch, ein Bekenntnis: Die Debatte um Günter Grass' "Beim Häuten der Zwiebel."* Göttingen: Steidl, 2007.

Kommunistischer Studentenverband. *Die Formierte Universität: Hochschulreform in der BRD und Westberlin*. Cologne: Verlag Wissenschaft im Klassenkampf, 1977.

Korff, Gottfried. "Change of Name as Change of Paradigm: The Renaming of Folklore Studies Departments at German Universities as an Attempt at 'Denationalization.'" *Europaea* 2, no. 2 (1996): 9–32.

———. *KriegsVolksKunde: Zur Erfahrungsbindung durch Symbolbildung*. Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 2005.

———. "Namenwechsel als Paradigmenwechsel? Die Umbenennung des Faches Volkskunde an deutschen Universitäten als Versuch einer 'Entnationalisierung.'" In *Fünfzig Jahre danach: Zur Nachgeschichte des Nationalsozialismus*, edited by Sigrid Weigel and Birgit R. Erdle, 379–402. Zürich: VDF, 1996.

———. “Spione, Hütchenspiele und Banana: Alltags-Symbole und -Metaphern im Prozeß der kulturellen Integration von Ost- und Westdeutschland.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 91, no. 2 (1995): 248–264.

Korff, Gottfried, Utz Jeggle, and Klaus Geiger, eds. *Abschied vom Volksleben*. Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1970.

Korff, Gottfried, and Gudrun M. König, eds. *Volkskunde ’00. Hochschulreform und Fachidentität: Hochschultagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde*. Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 2001.

Korom, Frank J. *The Anthropology of Performance: A Reader*. Wiley Blackwell Anthologies in Social and Cultural Anthropology 30. Hoboken: Wiley, 2013.

Koselleck, Reinhart. *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1985.

Köstlin, Konrad. “Archive, Materialien und Projekte: Wissensproduktion und disziplinäres Selbstverständnis.” In *Volkskundliche Grossprojekte: Ihre Geschichte und Zukunft*, edited by Christoph Schmitt, 15–31. Münster: Waxmann, 2005.

———. “DDR-Volkskunde: Die Entdeckung einer fernen Welt?” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 87 (1991): 225–243.

———. “Der Begriff Volkskultur und seine vielfältige Verwendung.” In *Münchner Streitgespräche zur Volkskultur: Dokumentation zur Tagung vom 28.–30. November 1986 im Hofbräuhaus am Platzl*, edited by Kulturreferat der Landeshauptstadt München, 12–15. Munich: Buchendorfer, 1990.

———. “Die Wiederkehr der Volkskultur: Der neue Umgang mit einem alten Begriff.” *Ethnologia Europaea* 14 (1984): 25–31.

Köstlin, Konrad, and Institut für Europäische Ethnologie. *Volkskultur und Moderne: Europäische Ethnologie zur Jahrtausendwende: Festschrift für Konrad Köstlin zum 60. Geburtstag am 8. Mai 2000*. Vienna: Selbstverlag des Instituts für Europäische Ethnologie, 2000.

Köstlin, Konrad, and Herbert Nikitsch, eds. *Die Wende als Wende: Orientierungen Europäischer Ethnologien nach 1989*. Vienna: Verlag des Instituts für Europäische Ethnologie, 2002.

Kothe, Heinz. “Die volkskundliche Forschung und Lehre in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik.” *Ethnologia Europaea* 1 (1967): 246–250.

Kramer, Dieter. “Aspekte der Kulturgeschichte des Tourismus.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 78, no. 1 (1982): 1–13.

———. *Europäische Ethnologie und Kulturwissenschaften*. Edited by Johanna Rolshoven. Marburg: Jonas, 2013.

———. “Probleme der gesellschaftlichen und beruflichen Praxis in der Kultursoziologie und europäische Ethnologie. Zur Diskussion um ‘Wem nützt Volkskunde?.’” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 67, no. 2 (1971): 228–243.

———. “Wem nützt Volkskunde?” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 66, no. 1/2 (1970): 1–16.

Krause, Martina, Dagmar Neuland-Kitzerow, Karoline Noack, and Tagung “Ethnologie und Gesellschaft. Blicke auf 50 Jahre ethnographisches Arbeiten in Berlin.” *Ethnografisches Arbeiten in Berlin: Wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Annäherungen*. Münster: LIT, 2003.

Kuhlmann, Angelika. “Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, 1918–1993.” *Jahrbuch für Volksliedforschung* 39 (1994): 139–140.

Kühn, Cornelia. “Sozialistische Wissenschaftspopularisierung: Volkskunde und Heimatgeschichte in der frühen DDR.” In *Horizonte ethnografischen Wissens: Eine Bestandsaufnahme*, edited by Ina Dietzsch, Wolfgang Kaschuba, and Leonore Scholze-Irrlitz, 131–54. Cologne: Böhlau, 2009.

Kühn, Cornelia, Sibylla Nikolow, and Arne Schirrmacher. “‘...eine neue, mit dem Volks verbundene Kultur entwickeln’—Laienkunst als Ressource für die Etablierung der Volkskunde in der frühen DDR.” In *Wissenschaft und Öffentlichkeit als Ressource füreinander*, 197–216. Frankfurt am Main, 2007.

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 3rd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Kuklick, Henrika, ed. *A New History of Anthropology*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2008.

Künsting, Sabine. “Hitler vorne, Hitler in der Mitte, Hitler hinten: Kritische Bemerkungen zu Andreas Bruck.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 87 (1991): 77–78.

Kuntz, Andreas. “Anmerkungen zum Handwerk im Nationalsozialismus.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 78, no. 2 (1982): 187–199.

Kuwayama, Takami. *Native Anthropology: The Japanese Challenge to Western Academic Hegemony*. Rosanna, Australia: Trans Pacific, 2004.

LaCapra, Dominick. *Rethinking Intellectual History: Texts, Contexts, Language*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1983.

LaCapra, Dominick, and Steven Laurence Kaplan, eds. *Modern European Intellectual History: Reappraisals and New Perspectives*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1982.

Landsberg, Alison. *Prosthetic Memory the Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.

Latour, Bruno. *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987.

———. *The Pasteurization of France*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Latour, Bruno, and Steve Woolgar. *Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Lauden, Rachel. "Redefinitions of a Discipline: Histories of Geology and Geological History." In *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*, edited by Wolf Lepenies, Peter Weingart, and Loren R. Graham, 79–104. Sociology of the Sciences 7. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1983.

Lee, You Jae. "Volkskunde in der DDR zwischen innovativen Methoden und politischer Einbindung 1963–1974." Magisterarbeit am Fachbereich Geschichtswissenschaften, Freie Universität Berlin, 1998.

Lefevere, André. *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. Translation Studies. London: Routledge, 1992.

Le Goff, Jacques. *History and Memory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.

Lehmann, Albrecht. "Militär als Forschungsproblem der Volkskunde." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 78, no. 2 (1982): 220–229.

Leiris, Michel. *Das Auge des Ethnographen*. Ethnologische Schriften. Frankfurt am Main: Syndikat, 1981.

Lenz, Siegfried. *Deutschstunde: Roman*. Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1968.

Leo, Annette. *Leben als Balance-Akt: Wolfgang Steinitz: Kommunist, Jude, Wissenschaftler*. Berlin: Metropol, 2005.

Lepenies, Wolf. *Das Ende der Naturgeschichte: Wandel kultureller Selbstverständlichkeiten in den Wissenschaften des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts*. Munich: Hanser, 1976.

———. *Wissenschaften im Nationalsozialismus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

Lepenies, Wolf, and Peter Weingart. "Introduction." In *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*, edited by Wolf Lepenies, Peter Weingart, and Loren R. Graham, ix – xx. Sociology of the Sciences. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1983.

Limón, José E., and M.J. Young. "Frontiers, Settlements and Development in Folklore Studies, 1972–1985." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15 (1986): 437–460.

Linde, Charlotte. *Working the Past: Narrative and Institutional Memory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Lindenberger, Thomas. *Herrschaft und Eigen-Sinn in der Diktatur: Studien zur Gesellschaftsgeschichte der DDR*. Cologne: Böhlau, 1999.

Lindner, Rolf. "Der zweite Abschied vom Volksleben." *Volkskultur und Moderne*, 2000, 149–155.

———. "Die Angst des Forschers vor dem Feld: Überlegungen zur teilnehmenden Beobachtung als Interaktionsprozess." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 77 (1981): 51–66.

———. *Die Entdeckung der Stadtkultur: Soziologie aus der Erfahrung der Reportage*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1990.

———. "Konjunktur und Krise des Kulturkonzepts." In *Kulturwissenschaften: Forschung—Praxis—Positionen*, edited by Lutz Musner and Gotthart Wunberg, 69–87. Vienna: WUV-Üniversitäts-Verlag, 2002.

Lips, Eva. "Anthropological and Folkloristic Institutions in the German Democratic Republic." *Current Anthropology* 2 (1961): 65–67.

Lixfeld, Hannjost. *Folklore and Fascism: The Reich Institute for German Volkskunde*. Edited by James R. Dow. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.

———. “The Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and the Umbrella Organizations of German ‘Volkskunde’ during the Third Reich.” *Asian Folklore Studies* 50, no. 1 (1991): 95–116.

Low, Alfred D. *The Third Reich and the Holocaust in German Historiography: Toward the Historikerstreit of the Mid-1980s*. New York: East European Monographs, 1994.

Lozoviuk, Petr, and Johannes Moser, eds. *Probleme und Perspektiven der volkskundlich-kulturwissenschaftlichen Fachgeschichtsschreibung. Versammelt die überarbeiteten Vorträge eines Arbeitstreffens, das am 26. und 27. November 2004 in Dresden unter dem Titel “Perspektiven und Probleme der ethnologischen Fachgeschichtsschreibung” veranstaltet hat*. Dresden: Thelem, 2005.

Luhmann, Niklas. *Social Systems*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Lutz, Gerhard. “Deutsche Volkskunde und europäische Ethnologie: Zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der 50er Jahre.” *Ethnologia Europaea* 4 (1970): 26–32.

———. “Die Entstehung der Ethnologie und das spätere Nebeneinander der Fächer Volkskunde und Völkerkunde in Deutschland.” In *Europäische Ethnologie*, edited by Heide Nixdorff and Thomas Hauschild, 29–46. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1982.

———. “Rückfall oder Methode? Bemerkungen zu einem leidigen Thema.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 67, no. 2 (1971): 244–247.

———. *Volkskunde: Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte ihrer Probleme, mit einem Geleitwort von Josef Dünninger*. Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1958.

———. “Volkskunde und Ethnologie.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 65, no. 1 (1969): 65–80.

———. “Volkskunde und Kulturanthropologie: Zur Frage der Ortsbestimmung unseres Faches.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 67, no. 1 (1971): 1–12.

Lutz, Helma, Marianne Schmidbaur, Verena Specht-Ronique, Jürgen Bauer, S. Bitter, Uwe Dettmar, Janina Delp, Uschi Heidel, and Katrin Klünter. “Ina-Maria Greverus: Aufbruch in die Kulturanthropologie.” In *Einzeln und Gemeinsam 100 Jahre starke Frauen an der Goethe-Universität*, 46–47. Frankfurt am Main: Gleichstellungsbüro Goethe Universität, 2014.

Maas, Utz. *Verfolgung und Auswanderung deutschsprachiger Sprachforscher 1933–1945*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2010.

Major, Patrick. *Behind the Berlin Wall East Germany and the Frontiers of Power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Malycha, Andreas, ed. *Geplante Wissenschaft: Eine Quellenedition zur DDR-Wissenschaftsgeschichte 1945-1961*. Leipzig: Akademische Verlagsanstalt, 2003.

Manfred Kittel. "Peripetie der Vergangenheitsbewältigung: Die Hakenkreuzschmierereien 1959/60 und das bundesdeutsche Verhältnis zum Nationalsozialismus." *Historisch-Politische Mitteilungen* 1, no. 1 (1994): 49–68.

Marchand, Suzanne L. *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Marcus, George E. *Ethnography Through Thick and Thin*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1998.

———. "Repatriating an Interpretive Anthropology: The American Studies / Cultural Criticism Connection." *American Anthropologist* 85, no. 4 (1983): 859–865.

Marcus, George E., and Michael M.J. Fischer. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Marcus, George E., and Fernando Mascarenhas. *Ocasião: The Marquis and the Anthropologist, a Collaboration*. Walnut Creek, Calif.: AltaMira, 2005.

Martin, Andreas. *Aus dem Nachlaß Adolf Spamers*. Dresden: Arbeitsgruppe Volkskunde am Institut für Geschichte der Technischen Universität Dresden, 1997.

Martin, Anne, Barbara Hammerschmitt, Zeitgeschichtliches Forum Leipzig, and Haus der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. *Einsichten: Diktatur und Widerstand in der DDR*. Leipzig: Reclam, 2001.

März, Peter, Hans-Joachim Veen, and Markus Pieper, eds. *Woran erinnern?: Der Kommunismus in der deutschen Erinnerungskultur*. Cologne: Böhlau, 2006.

Maus, Heinz. "Zur Situation der deutschen Volkskunde." *Die Umschau: Internationale Revue* 1, no. 3 (1946): 349–359.

Mayer, Hans. *Wendezeiten: Über Deutsche und Deutschland*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1993.

Mayr, Andrea. *Language and Power: An Introduction to Institutional Discourse*. New York: Continuum, 2008.

Mees, Bernard. *The Science of the Swastika*. New York: Central European University Press, 2008.

Meier-Hüsing, Peter. *Universität Bremen 40 Jahre in Bewegung*. Bremen: Ed. Temmen, 2011.

Meier, John. *Der Verband deutscher Vereine für Volkskunde: Sein Werden und Wirken 1904–1944*. Lahr: Schauenburg, 1947.

———. "Der Verband deutscher Vereine für Volkskunde: Sein Werden und Wirken 1904–1954." In *50 Jahre Verband der Vereine für Volkskunde 1904–1954*, 3–27. Stuttgart: Verband der Vereine für Volkskunde, 1954.

Meinecke, Friedrich. *Die deutsche Katastrophe, Betrachtungen und Erinnerungen*. Wiesbaden: E. Brockhaus, 1946.

Meinhof, Ulrike Marie. *Deutschland, Deutschland unter anderm: Aufsätze und Polemiken*. Berlin: Wagenbach, 1995.

———. *Everybody Talks about the Weather—We Don't: The Writings of Ulrike Meinhof*. Edited by Karin Bauer. New York: Seven Stories, 2008.

Meisen, Karl. "Der gegenwärtige Stand der wissenschaftlichen Volkskunde." *Rheinisches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 3 (1952): 7ff.

———. "Europäische Volkskunde als Forschungsaufgabe." *Reinisches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 3 (1952): 7ff.

Merback, Mitchell B. *Pilgrimage & Pogrom: Violence, Memory, and Visual Culture at the Host-Miracle Shrines of Germany and Austria*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2012.

Merkel, Ina. *"Wir sind doch nicht die Meckerecke der Nation": Briefe an das Fernsehen der DDR*. Berlin: Schwarzkopf & Schwarzkopf, 2000.

Merton, Robert King. *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Mesch, Claudia. *Modern Art at the Berlin Wall Demarcating Culture in the Cold War Germanys*. New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2008.

Mikhman, Dan. *Remembering the Holocaust in Germany, 1945–2000: German Strategies and Jewish Responses*. New York: P. Lang, 2002.

Mischek, Udo. "Fachgeschichte aus ethnologischer Perspektive." In *Probleme und Perspektiven der volkskundlich-kulturwissenschaftlichen Fachgeschichtsschreibung. Versammelt die überarbeiteten Vorträge eines Arbeitstreffens, das am 26. und 27. November 2004 in Dresden unter dem Titel "Perspektiven und Probleme der ethnologischen Fachgeschichtsschreibung" veranstaltet hat*, edited by Petr Lozoviuk and Johannes Moser, 67–78. Dresden: Thelem, 2005.

Mitscherlich, Alexander, and Margarete Mitscherlich. *Die Unfähigkeit zu trauern: Grundlagen kollektiven Verhaltens*. Munich: Piper, 1967.

Mohrmann, Ute. "Die 'Volkskunde des Neubeginns' während der fünfziger Jahre in der DDR im Kontext damaliger Kulturpolitik." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 87 (1991a): 196–206.

———. "Die 'Volkskunde des Neubeginns' während der fünfziger Jahre in der DDR im Kontext damaliger Kulturpolitik." In *Beiträge zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Volkskunde im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, edited by Kai Detlev Sievers, 217–229. Neumünster: K. Wachholtz, 1991b.

———. "Kolloqium 'Dreißig Jahre Ethnographie an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin 1952 bis 1982' am 17.01.1983." *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde und Kulturgeschichte* 27, Neue Folge 12 (1984): 154–156.

———. "'roundabout 68'—Zur DDR-Volkskunde Ende der sechziger und während der siebziger Jahre." In *Volkskundliche Tableaus: Eine Festschrift für Martin Scharfe zum 65. Geburtstag von Weggefährten, Freunden und Schülern*, edited by Siegfried Becker, 375–384. Münster: Waxmann, 2001.

———. "Volkskunde in der DDR während der 50er und 60er Jahre—Ein Überblick." In *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Volkskunde: Eine Wissenschaft im Widerspruch zwischen Leistung und Versagen*, 103–120. Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der HU Berlin. Reihe Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften 40.11. Berlin: Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, 1991.

———. "Volkskunde in der DDR während der fünfziger und sechziger Jahre." In *Völkische Wissenschaft: Gestalten und Tendenzen der deutschen und österreichischen Volkskunde in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Wolfgang Jacobeit, Hannjost Lixfeld, and Olaf Bockhorn, 375–96. Vienna: Böhlau, 1994.

———. “Volkskunde in the German Democratic Republic on the Eve of Its Dissolution.” In *Studying Peoples in the People’s Democracies: Socialist Era Anthropology in East-Central Europe*, edited by Chris M. Hann, Mihály Sárkány, and Peter Skalník, 195–209. Münster: LIT, 2005.

Moser, Dietz-Rüdiger. “Nationalsozialistische Fastnachsdeutung.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 78, no. 2 (1982): 200–229.

Moser, Hans. *Der Folklorismus als Forschungsproblem der Volkskunde*. Giessen: Schmitz, 1964.

———. “Gedanken zur heutigen Volkskunde: Ihre Situation, ihre Problematik, ihre Aufgaben.” *Bayerisches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde*, 1954, 208–234.

———. “Vom Folklorismus in unserer Zeit.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*, 1962.

———. “Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl und die Volkskunde: Eine wissenschaftliche Korrektur.” *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 1 (1978): 9–66.

Mosse, George L. *The Crisis of German Ideology: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich*. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1964.

Müller, Jan-Werner. *Another Country: German Intellectuals, Unification and National Identity*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2000.

Müns, Heike, and Thomas Scholze. “Volkskunde in der DDR. Forschungs- und Ausbildungsstrukturen zur Zeit der ‘Wende.’” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 87 (1991): 84–90.

Nader, Laura. “Up the Anthropologist: Perspectives Gained from Studying Up.” In *Reinventing Anthropology*, edited by Dell H. Hymes, 284–331. New York: Vintage, 1972.

Naumann, Hans. *Deutsche Volkskunde*. Gotha: Perthes, 1921.

Naumann, Hans, and Ida Blum Naumann. *Primitive Gemeinschaftskultur: Beiträge zur Volkskunde und Mythologie*. Jena: E. Diederichs, 1921.

Nedo, Paul. “Bedeutung und Aufgaben der Volkskundeforschung der Gegenwart.” *Aus der Arbeit der Natur- und Heimatfreunde*, 1956, 140–151.

Needham, Anuradha Dingwaney, and Carol Maier. *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross-Cultural Texts*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1995.

Neuland-Kitzerow, Dagmar, and Ute Mohrmann, eds. *Akteure—Praxen—Theorien: Der Ethnografin Ute Mohrmann zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*. Münster: LIT, 2010.

Niefanger, Dirk, and Walter Erhart. *Zwei Wendezeiten: Blicke auf die deutsche Literatur 1945 und 1989*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1997.

Nipperdey, Thomas. *Deutsche Geschichte 1800–1866: Bürgerwelt und starker Staat*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1983.

———. "Die anthropologische Dimension der Geschichtswissenschaft." In *Gesellschaft, Kultur, Theorie: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur neueren Geschichte*, edited by Thomas Nipperdey, 33–58. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1976.

Niven, William John, and James Jordan. *Politics and Culture in Twentieth-Century Germany*. Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2003.

Nixdorff, Heide. "Vorwort." In *Europäische Ethnologie*, edited by Heide Nixdorff and Thomas Hauschild, 9–10. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1982.

Nixdorff, Heide, and Thomas Hauschild, eds. *Europaïsche Ethnologie: Theorie- und Methodendiskussion aus ethnologischer und volkskundlicher Sicht*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1982.

Noack, Karoline, and Martina Krause. "Ethnographie as a Unified Anthropological Science in the German Democratic Republic." In *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies: Socialist Era Anthropology in East-Central Europe*, edited by Chris M. Hann, Mihály Sárkány, and Peter Skalník, 26–53. Münster: LIT, 2005.

Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire." *Representations* 26 (1989): 7–24.

———. *Rethinking France (Les Lieux de Mémoire)*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Nowotny, Helga, Peter Scott, and Michael Gibbons. *Re-Thinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity, 2001.

Oesterle, Anka. “John Meier und das SS-Ahnenerbe.” In *Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus: Referate und Diskussionen einer Tagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, München, 23. bis 25. Oktober 1986*, edited by Helge Gerndt, 83–94. Munich: Münchner Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1989.

Ottenjann, Helmut, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, and Museumsdorf Cloppenburg, eds. *Kulturgeschichte und Sozialgeschichte im Freilichtmuseum: Historische Realität und Konstruktion des Geschichtlichen in historischen Museen. Referate der 6. Arbeitstagung der Arbeitsgruppe “Kulturgeschichtliche Museen” im Museumsdorf Cloppenburg, Niedersächsisches Freilichtmuseum*. 1. Auflage. Cloppenburg: Das Museumsdorf, 1985.

Parkes, K. Stuart. *Writers and Politics in Germany, 1945–2008*. Studies in German Literature, Linguistics, and Culture. Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2009.

Peesch, Reinhard, and Rolf Döhler. “Folklore Studies in the German Democratic Republic, 1955–1965.” *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 5, no. 2/3 (1968): 249–266.

Pence, Katherine, and Paul Betts. *Socialist Modern: East German Everyday Culture and Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2008.

Penny, H. Glenn. *Objects of Culture: Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

———. “Traditions in the German Language.” In *A New History of Anthropology*, edited by Henrika Kuklick, 79–95. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2008.

Penny, H. Glenn, and Matti Bunzl. *Worldly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003.

Petzold, Joachim. *Parteinahme wofür?: DDR-Historiker im Spannungsfeld von Politik und Wissenschaft*. Edited by Martin Sabrow. Potsdam: Verlag für Berlin-Brandenburg, 2000.

Peuckert, Will-Erich. “Zur Situation der Volkskunde.” *Die Nachbarn: Jahrbuch für vergelichende Volkskunde* 1 (1948): 130–135.

Peuckert, Will-Erich, and Otto Lauffer. *Volkskunde: Quellen und Forschungen seit 1930*. Bern: Francke, 1951.

Picard, Max. *Hitler in uns selbst*. Erlenbach-Zürich: E. Rentsch, 1946.

Pickering, Andrew. *The Mangle of Practice: Time, Agency, and Science*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Pizer, John David. *Imagining the Age of Goethe in German Literature, 1970–2010*. Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2011.

Popper, Karl R. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. New York: Basic, 1959.

Powell, Larson. "The Meaning of Working through the East." *German Studies Review* 37, no. 3 (2014): 597–614.

Rabinow, Paul. *French Modern: Norms and Forms of the Social Environment*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1989.

———. *Reflections on Fieldwork in Morocco*. Quantum Book. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Raßloff, Steffen. "Martin Wähler (1889–1953): Volkskundler im Spannungsfeld von Wissenschaft und völkischer Ideologie." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 102, no. 2 (2006): 195–219.

Rathgeb, Eberhard. *Die engagierte Nation: Deutsche Debatten 1945–2005*. Munich: Hanser, 2005.

Rechtien, Renate, and Dennis Tate, eds. *Twenty Years On: Competing Memories of the GDR in Postunification German Culture*. Studies in German Literature Linguistics and Culture, 110. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2011.

Reichel, Peter. *Vergangenheitsbewältigung in Deutschland: Die Auseinandersetzung mit der NS-Diktatur von 1945 bis heute*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 2001.

Renneberg, Monika, and Mark Walker. *Science, Technology, and National Socialism*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Richmond, W. Edson. "Sigurd Erixon (1888–1968)." *The Journal of American Folklore* 81, no. 322 (1968): 348.

Ricœur, Paul. *Memory, History, Forgetting*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Riedl, Norbert. "Contemporary Ethnographic Studies and Research Trends in the German Democratic Republic." In *A Symposium on East European Ethnography*, edited by Zdeněk Salzmann, 65–73. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 1970.

Ringer, Fritz K. *The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890–1933*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969.

Röhrich, Lutz. *Bibliographie volkskundlicher Dissertationen an deutschen Universitäten 1945–1950*. Stuttgart: Württembergische Landesstelle für Volkskunde, 1951.

Römhild, Regina. "Confronting the Logic of the Nation-State: Transnational Migration and Cultural Globalisation in Germany." *Ethnologia Europaea* 33, no. 1 (2003): 61–72.

———. *Die Macht des Ethnischen: Grenzfall Russlanddeutsche. Perspektiven einer politischen Anthropologie*. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1998.

———. "Ethnografie und Imagination: Das neue europäische Grenzregime als Forschungsfeld." In *Grenzen und Differenzen: Zur Macht sozialer und kultureller Grenzziehungen*, edited by Thomas Hengartner and Johannes Moser, 175–184. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2006.

———. "Fremdzuschreibungen-Selbstpositionierungen: Die Praxis der Ethnisierung im Alltag der Einwanderungsgesellschaft." In *Ethnizität und Migration: Einführung in Wissenschaft und Arbeitsfelder*, edited by Brigitta Schmidt-Lauber, 157–177. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 2006.

———. *Histourismus: Fremdenverkehr und lokale Selbstbehauptung*. Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie der Universität Frankfurt, 1990.

———. "Home-Made Cleavages: Ethnonational Discourse, Diasporization, and the Politics of Germanness." *Anthropological Journal on European Cultures* 8 (1999): 99–120.

———. "Nach der 'Gastarbeit': Transitgesellschaft Europa." In *Projekt Migration*, edited by Kölnischer Kunstverein, 92–97. Cologne: Dumont, 2005.

———. "Topografien des Glücks: An den Kreuzungen von Migration und Tourismus." In *Paradies: Topografien der Sehnsucht*, edited by Manuela Gerlo and Claudia Benthien, 217–230. Cologne: Böhlau, 2010.

Rösch, Felix. *Émigré Scholars and the Genesis of International Relations: A European Discipline in America?*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Ross, Corey. *The East German Dictatorship: Problems and Perspectives in the Interpretation of the GDR*. London: Arnold, 2002.

Ruby, Jay. *A Crack in the Mirror: Reflexive Perspectives in Anthropology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982.

Rynkiewich, Michael A., and James P. Spradley. *Ethics and Anthropology: Dilemmas in Fieldwork*. New York: Wiley, 1976.

Sabrow, Martin. *Das Diktat des Konsenses: Geschichtswissenschaft in der DDR 1949–1969*. Munich: Oldenbourg, 2001.

Sabrow, Martin, ed. *Geschichte als Herrschaftsdiskurs: Der Umgang mit der Vergangenheit in der DDR*. Zeithistorische Studien 14. Cologne: Böhlau, 2000.

———. , ed. *Verwaltete Vergangenheit: Geschichtskultur und Herrschaftslegitimation in der DDR*. Leipzig: Akademische Verlagsanstalt, 1997.

Sabrow, Martin, and Peter T. Walther. *Historische Forschung und sozialistische Diktatur: Beiträge zur Geschichtswissenschaft der DDR*. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 1995.

Saunders, Anna, and Debbie Pinfold, eds. *Remembering and Rethinking the GDR: Multiple Perspectives and Plural Authenticities*. Palgrave Macmillan Memory Studies. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Schafft, Gretchen Engle. *From Racism to Genocide: Anthropology in the Third Reich*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004.

Scharfe, Martin. *Brauchforschung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1991.

Schechner, Richard, and Victor W. Turner. *Between Theater & Anthropology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.

Scheer, Monique, Thomas Thiemeyer, Reinhard Johler, and Bernhard Tschofen, eds. *Out of the Tower: Essays on Culture and Everyday Life*. Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 2013.

Scheffer, Thomas, and Christian Meyer. "Tagungsbericht: Soziologische vs. ethnologische Ethnographie—Zur Belastbarkeit und Perspektive einer Unterscheidung. Institut für Europäische Ethnologie (IfEE) der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, 21. bis 22. Mai 2010." *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*

12, no. 1, art. 25 (January 2011). http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1620/3123.

Schier, Bruno. "Internationaler Kongress für Volkskunde in Arnheim (20.–24. September 1955)." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 52 (1955): 297–298.

Civil Enculturation: Nation-State, Schools, and Ethnic Difference in Four European Countries. New York: Berghahn, 2004.

Schiffauer, Werner. "Die Angst vor der Differenz: Zur neuen Strömungen in der Kulturanthropologie." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 92, no. 1 (1996): 20–31.

———. *Die Gewalt der Ehre: Erklärungen zu einem deutsch-türkischen Sexualkonflikt*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1983.

———. *Die Gottesmänner: Türkische Islamisten in Deutschland. Eine Studie zur Herstellung religiöser Evidenz*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2000.

———. *Islamism in the Diaspora: The Fascination of Political Islam among Second Generation German Turks*. Oxford: University of Oxford. Transnational Communities Programme, 1999.

———. *Kulturelle Charakteristika als Bedingungen intellektueller Kommunikation: Die türkische Minderheit*. Weinheim: Beltz, 1986.

———. *Migration und kulturelle Differenz: Studie für das Büro der Ausländerbeauftragten des Senats von Berlin*. Berlin: Die Ausländerbeauftrage des Senats, 2002.

———. *Nach dem Islamismus: Eine Ethnographie der Islamischen Gemeinschaft Milli Görüs*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2010.

———. *Parallelgesellschaften: Wie viel Wertekonsens braucht unsere Gesellschaft?: Für eine kluge Politik der Differenz*. Bielefeld: Transcript, 2008.

———. *Staat—Schule—Ethnizität: Politische Sozialisation von Immigrantenkindern in vier europäischen Ländern*. Münster: Waxmann, 2002.

Schippers, Thomas K. "A History of Paradoxes: Anthropologies of Europe." In *Fieldwork and Footnotes: Studies in the History of European Anthropology*, edited by Han F. Vermeulen and Arturo Alvarez Roldán, 234–46. London: Routledge, 1995.

Schissler, Hanna, ed. *The Miracle Years: A Cultural History of West Germany, 1949–1968*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Schivelbusch, Wolfgang. *In a Cold Crater Cultural and Intellectual Life in Berlin, 1945–1948*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Schmidt, Andreas. "Die Poesie der Kultur: Ein Versuch über die Krise der wissenschaftlichen Volkskunde." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 92 (1996): 66–76.

Schmidt-Lauber, Brigitta. "Seeing, Hearing, Feeling, Writing: Approaches and Methods from the Perspective of Ethnological Analysis of the Present." In *A Companion to Folklore*, edited by Galit Hasan-Rokem and Regina F. Bendix, translated by Andreas Hemming, 559–78. Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

Schmidt, Leopold. "Die Volkskunde als Geisteswissenschaft." *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Prähistorie* 73/77 (1947): 115–137.

Schmitz, Helmut, ed. *A Nation of Victims?: Representations of German Wartime Suffering from 1945 to the Present*. German Monitor 67. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007.

Schmoll, Friedemann. *Die Vermessung der Kultur: Der "Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde" und die Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, 1928–1980*. Stuttgart: Steiner, 2009.

Schöck, Gustav. "Sammeln und Retten: Anmerkungen zu zwei Prinzipien volkskundlicher Empirie." In *Abschied vom Volksleben*, 85–104. Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1970.

Scholte, Bob. "Cultural Anthropology and the Paradigm-Concept: A Brief History of Their Recent Convergence." In *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*, edited by Loren R. Graham, Wolf Lepenies, and Peter Weingart, 229–278. Sociology of the Sciences 7. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1983.

Scholze, Thomas. "Adolf Spamer (1883–1953)—Wissenschaftsgrundsätze." In *Geschichte der Völkerkunde und Volkskunde an der Berliner Universität: Zur Aufarbeitung des Wissenschaftserbes*, edited by Hannelore Bernhardt, 53–60. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin 28. Berlin: Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, 1991.

———. “Thesen für einen Abriss zur Geschichte der Volkskunde in der DDR.” In *Beiträge zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Volkskunde im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, edited by Kai Detlev Sievers, 231–45. Neumünster: K. Wachholtz, 1991.

Scholze, Thomas, and Leonore Scholze-Irrlitz, eds. *Zehn Jahre Gesellschaft für Ethnographie—Europäische Ethnologie in Berlin: Wolfgang Jacobeit zum 80. Geburtstag*. Münster: LIT, 2001.

Schrire, Dani. “Raphael Patai, Jewish Folklore, Comparative Folkloristics, and American Anthropology.” *Journal of Folklore Research* 47, no. 1/2 (2010): 7–43.

Schuhladen, Hans. “Wieviel Vielfalt ertragen wir? Zur Pluralität der multikulturellen Gesellschaft.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 90, no. 1 (1994): 37–58.

Schulze, Winfried, and Otto Gerhard Oexle, eds. *Deutsche Historiker im Nationalsozialismus*. Frankfurt: Fischer Taschenbuch, 1999.

Schweizer, Katja. *Täter und Opfer in der DDR: Vergangenheitsbewältigung nach der zweiten deutschen Diktatur*. Münster: LIT, 1999.

Schwietering, Julius. “Wesen und Aufgaben der deutschen Volkskunde.” *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 5 (1927): 748–765.

Sebald, W.G. *Luftkrieg und Literatur: Mit einem Essay zu Alfred Andersch*. Munich: Hanser, 1999.

Seifert, Manfred. *Kulturarbeit im Reichsarbeitsdienst: Theorie und Praxis nationalsozialistischer Kulturpflege im Kontext historisch-politischer, organisatorischer und ideologischer Einflüsse*. Münster: Waxmann, 1996.

———. “Reichsarbeitsdienst und Volkskunde: Zur Instrumentalisierung volkskundlicher Inhalte, Personen und Institutionen durch nationalsozialistische Erziehung und Kulturarbeit.” *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 17 (1994): 97–118.

Serres, Michel. *The Birth of Physics*. Manchester: Clinamen, 2000.

Shandley, Robert R. *Rubble Films: German Cinema in the Shadow of the Third Reich*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Temple University Press, 2001.

———. *Unwilling Germans?: The Goldhagen Debate*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.

Sievers, Kai Detlev, ed. *Beiträge zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte der Volkskunde im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. Neumünster: K. Wachholtz, 1991.

———. "Migration: Fünf Jahrhunderte Wanderungsbewegungen der Föhringer." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 68 (1972): 213–235.

Silberman, Marc. *What Remains?: East German Culture and the Postwar Public*. Washington, D.C.: American Institute for Contemporary German Studies, 1997.

Silberman, Marc, and Henning Wrage. *DEFA at the Crossroads of East German and International Film Culture: A Companion*, 2014.

Šmidchens, Guntis. "Folklorism Revisited." *Journal of Folklore Research* 36, no. 1 (1999): 51–70.

Snow, C.P. *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Spamer, Adolf. *Wesen, Wege und Ziele der Volkskunde.* Leipzig: F. Brandstetter, 1928.

Spies, Britta. "Zur Geschichte der Volkskunde: Personen-Programme-Positionen. Tagung des Instituts für Sächsische Geschichte und Volkskunde e.V., Dresden, 20/21. November 2000." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 98 (2002): 65ff.

Stäheli, Urs. "Die Nachträglichkeit der Semantik: Zum Verhältnis von Sozialstruktur und Semantik." *Soziale Systeme* 4, no. 2 (1998): 315–340.

Steinitz, Klaus, and Wolfgang Kaschuba. *Wolfgang Steinitz: Ich hatte unwahrscheinliches Glück. Ein Leben zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik*. Berlin: Dietz, 2006.

Steinitz, Wolfgang. *Die volkskundliche Arbeit in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik: Vortrag, gehalten auf der Volkskunde-Tagung der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin vom 4. bis 6. September 1953*. Edited by Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin-Ost). Leipzig: Zentralhaus für Laienkunst, 1953.

———. "Volkskunde und Völkerkunde." *Deutsches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 1, no. 1 (1955): 269–275.

Stein, Mary Beth. "Coming to Terms with the Past: The Depiction of 'Volkskunde' in the Third Reich since 1945." *Journal of Folklore Research* 24, no. 2 (1987): 157–185.

Stocking, George W. *After Tylor: British Social Anthropology, 1888–1951*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995.

———. , ed. *Colonial Situations: Essays on the Contextualization of Ethnographic Knowledge*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.

———. , ed. *Functionalism Historicized: Essays on British Social Anthropology*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984.

———. , ed. *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

———. *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology*. New York: Free Press, 1968.

———. , ed. *Volksgeist as Method and Ethic Essays on Boasian Ethnography and the German Anthropological Tradition*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996.

Stoklund, Bjarne, and Bengt Holbek. *Europäische Ethnologie*. Würzburg: Bayerische Blätter für Volkskunde, 1981.

Strathern, Marilyn. *Partial Connections*. Savage, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1991.

Streck, Bernhard, ed. *Ethnologie und Nationalsozialismus*. Gehren: Escher, 2000.

Strobach, Hermann. "'. . . aber wann beginnt der Vorkrieg?' Anmerkungen zum Thema Volkskunde und Faschismus (vor und um 1933)." In *Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus: Referate und Diskussionen einer Tagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, München, 23. bis 25. Oktober 1986*, edited by Helge Gerndt, 23–38. Munich: Münchner Vereinigung für Volkskunde, 1989.

———. "Der marxistische Volksbegriff und seine Bedeutung für die Bestimmung des Forschungsgegenstandes der Volkskunde." *Ethnographia* 80 (1969): 162–174.

———. "Positionen und Grenzen der 'kritischen Volkskunde' in der BRD." *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde und Kulturgeschichte* 16, Neue Folge 1 (1973): 45–91.

———. "Volkskundliche Forschung an der ehemaligen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 87 (1991): 207–224.

Strobach, Hermann, Rudolf Weinhold, and Bernhard Weissel. "Volkskundliche Forschungen in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik: Bilanz und Ausblick." *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde und Kulturgeschichte* 17, Neue Folge 2 (1974): 9–39.

Suleiman, Susan Rubin. *Crises of Memory and the Second World War*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Suleiman, Susan Rubin. "The 1.5 Generation: Thinking About Child Survivors and the Holocaust." *American Imago* 59, no. 3 (2002): 277–295.

Svensson, Sigfrid. *Einführung in die europäische Ethnologie*. Meisenheim am Glan: A. Hain, 1973.

Szöllösi-Janze, Margit. *Science in the Third Reich*. New York: Berg, 2001.

Szondi, Peter. *Einführung in die literarische Hermeneutik*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1975.

Taberner, Stuart. *German Literature of the 1990s and beyond: Normalization and the Berlin Republic*. Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2005.

Taberner, Stuart, and Paul Cooke, eds. *German Culture, Politics, and Literature into the Twenty-First Century: Beyond Normalization*. Studies in German Literature, Linguistics, and Culture. Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2006.

Taberner, Stuart, and Frank Finlay. *Recasting German Identity: Culture, Politics, and Literature in the Berlin Republic*. Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2002.

"The EU Model." *European Union*. Accessed April 20, 2015. http://europa.eu/about-eu/basic-information/symbols/motto/index_en.htm.

Thompson, John B. "Editor's Introduction." In *Language and Symbolic Power*, by Pierre Bourdieu, 1–31. Cambridge: Polity, 1991.

Till, Karen E. *The New Berlin: Memory, Politics, Place*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.

Tracy, Sarah J. *Qualitative Research Methods Collecting Evidence, Crafting Analysis, Communicating Impact*. Chicester: Wiley, 2012.

Tschofen, Bernhard. "The Habit of Folklore: Remarks on Lived Volkskunde and the Everyday Practice of European Ethnology after the End of Faith." *Journal of Folklore Research* 36, no. 2/3 (1999): 235-242.

Turner, Victor W. *The Anthropology of Performance*. Performance Studies Series 4. New York: PAJ Publications, 1988.

Tyler, Stephen A. *India: An Anthropological Perspective*. Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland, 1986.

Tymoczko, Maria, and Edwin Gentzler. *Translation and Power*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002.

Venuti, Lawrence. *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*. London: Routledge, 1992.

———. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London: Routledge, 1998.

———. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge, 1995.

"Volkskunde im Widerstreit. 1. Volkstumsideologie einst und jetzt." *Wissenschaft und Bildung*. Deutschlandfunk, January 10, 1972.

"Volkskunde im Widerstreit. 2. Klassenideologie oder kritische Reflexion." *Wissenschaft und Bildung*. Deutschlandfunk, January 17, 1972.

"Volkskunde im Widerstreit. 3. Theorienstreit als Methodenproblem." *Wissenschaft und Bildung*. Deutschlandfunk, January 24, 1972.

"Volkskunde im Widerstreit. 4. Reformdiskussion und die Folgen." *Wissenschaft und Bildung*. Deutschlandfunk, January 31, 1972.

Vom Bruch, Rüdiger. "A Slow Farewell to Humboldt? Stages in the History of German Universities, 1810–1945." In *German Universities, Past and Future: Crisis or Renewal?*, edited by Mitchell G. Ash, 3–27. Oxford: Berghahn, 1997.

Von Geramb, Viktor. "Der Volksbegriff in der Geistesgeschichte und in der Volkskunde." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 50, no. 1/2 (1953): 7–34.

Wähler, Martin. "Volkskunde als Grundwissenschaft: Die Aufgabe der sozialen Volkskunde." *Niederdeutsches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 22 (1947): 111–145.

Wallnöfer, Elsbeth. *Mass nehmen, Mass halten: Frauen im Fach Volkskunde*. Vienna: Böhlau, 2008.

Walser, Martin. *Ansprachen aus Anlaß der Verleihung des Friedenspreises des Deutschen Buchhandels an Martin Walser in der Paulskirche zu Frankfurt am Main*. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag der Buchhändler-Vereinigung, 1998.

Walsh, James P., and Gerardo Rivera Ungson. "Organizational Memory." *Academy of Management Review* 21, no. 1 (1991): 57–91.

Warneken, Bernd Jürgen. "'Völkisch nicht beschränkte Volkskunde': Eine Erinnerung an die Gründungsphase des Fachs vor 100 Jahren." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 95 (1999): 169–196.

———. "Zum Kulturbegriff der Empirischen Kulturwissenschaft." In *Kultur—Ein interdisziplinäres Kolloquium zur Begrifflichkeit, Halle an der Saale, 18. bis 21. Februar 1999*, edited by Siegfried Fröhlich, 207–13. Halle an der Saale: Landesamt für Denkmalpflege und Archäologie Sachsen-Anhalt, 2000.

Weber, Hermann. *Aufbau und Fall einer Diktatur: Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte der DDR*. Cologne: Bund-Verlag, 1991.

Weber-Kellermann, Ingeborg. "Adolf Spamer zum Gedächtnis: 10. April 1883 bis 20. Juni 1953." *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde*, 1953, 219–225.

———. *Deutsche Volkskunde zwischen Germanistik und Sozialwissenschaften*. Sammlung Metzler 79. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1969.

———. *Einführung in die Volkskunde, Europäische Ethnologie: Eine Wissenschaftsgeschichte*. 2. erweiterte und ergänzte Auflage. Sammlung Metzler 79. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1985.

———. "Internationaler Volkskundekongress vom 20. bis 24. September 1955 in Arnhem / Holland." *Deutsches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 2 (1956): 264–266.

———. "Zehn Jahre Institut für deutsche Volkskunde." In *Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin 1946–1956*, edited by Johannes Irmscher, Werner Radig, and Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 435–447. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956.

———. "Zum Problem: Volkskunde und Völkerkunde." *Forschungen und Fortschritt* 27, no. 1 (1953): 30-32.

———. *Zur Interethnik: Donauschwaben, Siebenbürger Sachsen und ihre Nachbarn*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1978.

Weber-Kellermann, Ingeborg, Siegfried Becker, and Andreas C. Bimmer. *Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann: Erinnern und Vergessen. Autobiographisches und weitere Materialien*. Marburg: Jonas, 1998.

Weber-Kellermann, Ingeborg, Andreas C. Bimmer, and Siegfried Becker. *Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie: Eine Wissenschaftsgeschichte*. 3. vollständig überarbeitete und aktualisierte Auflage. Sammlung Metzler 79. Stuttgart: Metzler, 2003.

Weber-Kellermann, Ingeborg, Andreas C. Bimmer, and Dorothea Zeh. *Europäische Ethnologie in der beruflichen Praxis: Berichte aus Museum und Hochschule: Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann zum 26. 6. 1983 gewidmet von ihren Schülern*. Bonn: R. Habelt, 1983.

Wehdeking, Volker. *Die deutsche Einheit und die Schriftsteller: Literarische Verarbeitung der Wende seit 1989*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1995.

Weigel, Sigrid. "'Generation' as a Symbolic Form: On the Genealogical Discourse of Memory since 1945." *The Germanic Review: Literature, Culture, Theory* 77, no. 4 (2002): 264–277.

Weingart, Peter. *Die Wissenschaft der Öffentlichkeit: Essays zum Verhältnis von Wissenschaft, Medien und Öffentlichkeit*. Weilerswist: Velbrück Wissenschaft, 2005.

Weissel, Bernhard, ed. *Kultur und Ethnos: Zur Kritik der bürgerlichen Auffassungen über die Rolle der Kultur in Geschichte und Gesellschaft*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1980.

———. "Zum Gegenstand und zu den Aufgaben volkskundlicher Wissenschaft in der DDR." *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde und Kulturgeschichte* 16, Neue Folge 1 (1973): 9–44.

Weiss, Richard. *Volkskunde der Schweiz: Grundriss*. Erlenbach-Zürich: E. Rentsch, 1946.

Weiss, Sheila Faith. *The Nazi Symbiosis: Human Genetics and Politics in the Third Reich*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2010.

Wellek, René. *Concepts of Criticism*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1963.

Welsch, Wolfgang. *Die verklärte Diktatur: Der verdrängte Widerstand gegen den SED-Staat*. Aachen: Helios, 2009.

Welz, Gisela. “Beyond Tradition: Anthropology, Social Change, and Tourism in Cyprus.” *Peace Research Abstracts* 38, no. 4 (2001): 451–600.

———. “Ethnografien europäischer Modernen.” In *Ort. Arbeit. Körper: Ethnografie Europäischer Modernen. 34. Kongress der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde, Berlin 2003*, edited by Beate Binder, Wolfgang Kaschuba, Silke Göttsch, and Konrad Vanja, 19–31. Münster: Waxmann, 2005.

———. “Ethnology.” In *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, edited by James D. Wright, 2nd ed., 1–5. Amsterdam: Elsevier, forthcoming.

———. “Europa: Ein Kontinent—Zwei Ethnologien.” In *Ethnologie im 21. Jahrhundert*, edited by Thomas Bierschenk, Matthias Krings, and Carola Lentz, 1. Aufl., 211–27. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 2013.

———. *Inszenierungen kultureller Vielfalt: Frankfurt am Main und New York City*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1996.

———. Letter to Amanda Randall. “Re: Dissertation Quote Request,” February 22, 2015.

———. “Moving Targets: Feldforschung unter Mobilitätsdruck.” *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 94, no. 2 (1998): 177–194.

———. “Volkskunde, Europäische Ethnologie, Kulturanthropologie: De- und Rekonstruktionen von Disziplinarität.” In *Namen und was sie bedeuten: Zur Namensdebatte im Fach Volkskunde*, edited by Regina Bendix and Tatjana Eggeling, 29–44. Göttingen: Schmerse, 2004.

Welz, Gisela, and Petra Ilyes, eds. *Zypern: Gesellschaftliche Öffnung, europäische Integration, Globalisierung*. Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, 2001.

Welz, Gisela and Annina Lotterman, eds. *Projekte der Europäisierung: Kulturanthropologische Forschungsperspektiven*. Frankfurt am Main: Institut für Kulturanthropologie und Europäische Ethnologie der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, 2009.

Weninger, Robert, and Brigitte Rossbacher, eds. *Wendezeiten, Zeitenwenden: Positionsbestimmungen Zur Deutschsprachigen Literatur 1945–1995*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 1997.

White, Hayden V. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

———. "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality." *Critical Inquiry* 7, no. 1 (1980): 5–27.

———. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.

Wiegelmann, Günter. "The Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde and the Geographical Research Method." Translated by Joan L. Cotter. *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 5, no. 2/3 (1968): 187–197.

Wiegelmann, Günter, Gerhard Heilfurth, Walter Hävernick, Richard Wolfram, Leander Petzoldt, Hans Truemphy, Karl-Sigismund Kramer, et al. "Vom Nutzen und Nachteile der Volkskunde. Diskussion." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 66, no. 1/2 (1970): 17–59.

Wiegelmann, Günter, Matthias Zender, and Gerhard Heilfurth. *Volkskunde: Eine Einführung*. Berlin: E. Zender, 1977.

Wilking, Stefan. *Der Deutsche Sprachatlas im Nationalsozialismus: Studien zu Dialektologie und Sprachwissenschaft zwischen 1933 und 1945*. New York: G. Olms, 2003.

Williams, Arthur, K. Stuart Parkes, and Roland Smith, eds. *German Literature at a Time of Change 1989–1990: German Unity and German Identity in Literary Perspective*. New York: P. Lang, 1991.

Windmüller, Sonja, Beate Binder, and Thomas Hengartner, eds. *Kultur-Forschung: Zum Profil einer volkskundlichen Kulturwissenschaft*. Berlin: LIT, 2009.

Witte, Linda. "Sechste Doktorandentagung der Volkskunde / Europäischen Ethnologie / Kulturanthropologie / Empirischen Kulturwissenschaft. Institut für Kulturanthropologie / Europäische Ethnologie an der Georg-August Universität, Gottingen, 18.–20. März 2011." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 107 (2011): 202ff.

Wodak, Ruth, and Michael Meyer. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE, 2001.

Wrage, Henning. *Die Zeit der Kunst. Literatur, Film und Fernsehen in der DDR der 1960er Jahre: Eine Kulturgeschichte in Beispielen*. Heidelberg: Winter, 2008.

Young, James Edward. *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1993.

Zender, Matthias. "Volkskunde an den Universitäten der Bundesrepublik Deutschland." *Ethnologia Europaea* 1 (1967): 251–253.

Ziemba, Amanda. "Serendipity Principle." In *Von Alltagswelt bis Zwischenraum: Eine kleine kulturanthropologische Enzyklopädie*, edited by Gisela Welz, Ramona Lenz, and Ina-Maria Greverus, 121–122. Münster: LIT, 2005.

Zimmer, Eva. "Siebte Doktorandentagung der Volkskunde / Europäischen Ethnologie / Kulturanthropologie / Empirischen Kulturwissenschaft. Lehrstuhl für Europäische Ethnologie der Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg, 11.–13. Mai 2012." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 108 (2012): 111ff.

Zimmerman, Andrew. *Anthropology and Antihumanism in Imperial Germany*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Zimmermann, Harm-Peer. *Empirische Kulturwissenschaft, Europäische Ethnologie, Kulturanthropologie, Volkskunde: Leitfaden für das Studium einer Kulturwissenschaft an deutschsprachigen Universitäten—Deutschland, Österreich, Schweiz*. Marburg: Jonas, 2005.

Zwach, Eva. "Ein Volkskundler im Ersten Weltkrieg: Wilhelm Pessler und die Kriegsmuseum." *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 95, no. 1 (1999): 14–31.